

220.7 Sch. R. T135C

DUKE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
DURHAM, N. C.



C

Rec'd Dec. 22, 1926

Library Budget
Fund

The Bishop of London & Manor

With kindest thanks

for your help

Arthur J. Davis

Feb. 21. 1900

CHRIST AND THE NATIONS

CHRIST AND THE NATIONS

AN EXAMINATION OF OLD AND
NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING

BY

ARTHUR J. TAIT, B.D.

PRINCIPAL OF RIDLEY HALL, CAMBRIDGE, AND EXAMINING
CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
LONDON MCMX

87319

12/22/76

Budget f.

⁷⁶
g.e.\$-

\$1.00

Reliq. 76.

Sch. R.

220.7

✓ 135 C

IN PIAM MEMORIAM

PATRIS DILECTISSIMI

GEORGII MARTIN TAIT

87319

PREFACE

THE aim of this book is to show that the evangelization of the world in these latter days is part of the counsel of God, which was revealed with growing clearness through the utterances of Prophet and Psalmist, was declared anew by Christ, and was committed by Him to the Church for fulfilment.

The content of the Evangel is only incidentally referred to; the ways and means by which the Church of post-apostolic times has sought to fulfil the obligation, and the progress which has been made, are not dealt with; attention has been concentrated upon the obligation itself. The greater portion of the book has accordingly been devoted to the study of the gradual unfolding of the Divine plan. But

in the closing chapters I have gone further afield: the early steps are traced by which the exclusiveness of Judaism was made to give way to the catholicism of Christianity; and reference is made to the evidential value of the correspondence between the prophecy and the religious phenomena of our own day.

That the book may have some share, however small, in leading one and another to a clearer perception of the revealed purpose of God, is the prayer of its author as he commits it to the perusal of any in whose way it may fall.

To the acknowledgments of indebtedness introduced in the book itself, I desire to add an expression of gratitude for valued help to the Bishop of Sodor and Man; the Rev. W. E. Barnes, D.D., Hulsean Professor of Divinity; the Rev. R. Sinker, D.D.; the Rev. R. H. Charles, D.D.; and to my colleagues, the Revds. J. R. Darbyshire, M.A., and W. R. Whately, M.A.

A. J. T.

RIDLEY HALL, CAMBRIDGE,

The Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, 1910.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTORY

CHAPTER I

	PAGE
HOLY SCRIPTURE THE RECORD OF PROGRESSIVE REVELATION	3

The final appeal

The teaching of Christ was not an isolated revelation

It was prepared for by the Law and the Prophets and acted in turn as a preparation for that which is yet to be revealed

Every stage in God's dealings with man has been anticipated by prophecy

The universality of the Christian Church is no exception

PART I

THE REVELATION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

CHAPTER II

	PAGE
THE PRIMEVAL AND THE PATRIARCHAL PERIODS .	17

The Protevangelium

Its primary fulfilment in Jesus, "the Son of Man"

The oracle of Noah

The interpretation of "God shall enlarge Japhet," &c.

The promise given to the Patriarchs

The interpretation of Genesis xii. 3

Jacob's blessing

The interpretation of "until Shiloh come"

Summary

ADDITIONAL NOTE.—The predictions of the Book of Genesis	34
---	----

CHAPTER III

THE MOSAIC PERIOD	43
-----------------------------	----

The training of the chosen people

Its nature and method

Exterminating wars

The oracle of Balaam

"The star," and "the sceptre"

CHAPTER IV

	PAGE
THE PRE-EXILIC PROPHETS	53
The loss of the theocratic idea and the establish- ment of the monarchy	
The silence of Hosea, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Obadiah	
St. Paul's use of the Old Testament	
Amos	
The LXX. rendering of Amos ix. 12	
Jonah	
Joel	
The meaning of "all flesh "	
Micah	
Isaiah	
Zephaniah	

CHAPTER V

THE EXILIC AND POST-EXILIC PROPHETS	73
Jeremiah	
Ezekiel	
Isaiah, chaps. xl.-lxvi	
" The servant "	
Idolatry as the robbery of God	
Haggai	
" The desire of all nations "	
Zechariah	
Malachi	
The interpretation of Malachi i. 11	
Its use by early Christian writers	
Daniel	
" One like unto a son of man "	

CHAPTER VI

	PAGE
THE PSALMS	103
Their relation to the rest of the Old Testament, and particularly to the Prophets	
The two pictures of the future of the Gentiles	
The primary and ultimate references	
Experience and the development of doctrine	
Summary of the Old Testament revelation	
ADDITIONAL NOTE. — The extra-Canonical Jewish writings	115

PART II

THE REVELATION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER VII

THE PUBLIC MINISTRY OF CHRIST	129
The difference of attitude before and after the Resurrection	
Christ's refusal to be made known both by men generally and by the disciples	
The mission of the Twelve, and of the Seventy	
The reason for this attitude	
The one exception	
Two illustrations of Jesus' attitude towards the Gentiles in particular	
The mission of the Twelve	
The ministry in Tyre and Sidon	
Ewald's explanation	

CONTENTS

xiii

	PAGE
Direct intimations of the approaching change	
Anticipations in general teaching	
The expansive character of Christ's public ministry	
Summary	
ADDITIONAL NOTE.—The Son of Man	. 149

CHAPTER VIII

THE TEACHING OF THE FORTY DAYS	. 161
--------------------------------	-------

Two marked features of the records :

Absence of general information

Fulness in one particular

The diversity of the accounts due, in part, to the
repetition of the command

The principle of selection

St. Matthew. Jesus and the kingdom

St. Mark. Jesus and the individual

St. Luke. Jesus and the world

Two other features :

(1) The position assigned to the evangeliza-
tion of the world

(2) The ground on which it is based

St. John. Jesus and the Church

The account in Acts

The last utterance

The gift of the Spirit for the purpose of
witnessing

ADDITIONAL NOTE.—The commission of John xx. 23. 182

CHAPTER IX

	PAGE
THE MINISTRY AND TEACHING OF ST. PAUL	. 189
The conversion	
St. Paul and the older Apostles	
The preparation for St. Paul's work	
The baptism of Hellenists	
The appointment of the deacons	
The work of Philip	
St. Peter and Cornelius	
The Council of Jerusalem	
St. Paul's emphasis on the Divine origin of his apostleship	
His use of <i>μυστήριον</i>	
The moral government of the world	
All things to be summed up in Christ	
St. Paul's conception based on his vision of the Glorified Christ	
The necessity for St. Paul's conversion, in the light of a comparison between his attitude towards the Gentiles and that of contemporary Judaism	

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER X

THE EVIDENTIAL VALUE OF THE CATHOLICITY OF THE CHURCH 215
The ingathering of the nations only one feature of the prophetic picture of the latter days	

CONTENTS

xv

PAGE

The Messiah

Spiritual religion

The three features realized in Christianity

The correspondence of prophecy and fact

The prophecy did not produce the phenomena

The teaching of Christ a direct revelation

The argument from prophecy

Principle to be distinguished from method and
application

Illustration from Justin Martyr

Its bearing on the belief in the inspiration of the
Old Testament

INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES . . . 235

GENERAL INDEX 242

Cor Dei in verbis Dei

ST. GREGORY

Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet,

Vetus in Novo patet

ST. AUGUSTINE

INTRODUCTORY

HOLY SCRIPTURE THE RECORD OF
PROGRESSIVE REVELATION

The final appeal.

The teaching of Christ was not an isolated revelation.

It was prepared for by the Law and the Prophets, and acted in turn as a preparation for that which is yet to be revealed.

Every stage in God's dealings with man has been anticipated by prophecy.

The universality of the Christian Church is no exception.

CHAPTER I

HOLY SCRIPTURE THE RECORD OF PROGRESSIVE REVELATION

THE question as to whether the nations of the world ought to be evangelized by the Christian Church or not, must find its ultimate answer in the appeal to the revealed will of God. Reason may suggest that the revelation of God ought to be universally proclaimed. Charity may urge those who possess that revelation to impart their knowledge to those who are living without it. Jealousy for the glory of God may constrain monotheists to attack the idolatrous systems of the world, by which that glory is being given to those who are no gods (*cf.* Isa. xlii. 8). And yet the promptings of reason, charity,

4 HOLY SCRIPTURE THE RECORD OF

and jealousy for the glory of God, cannot always be trusted to settle the course which the Church must pursue. When opposition seems insuperable, in times of failure and disappointment, in the hour when the bitter experience of defeat and the apparent waste of life and money quench the ardour of love and make the voice of reason sound the retreat, it is only the certain knowledge of the purpose of God which can enable the Church to decide whether the cost must be faced and the work accomplished.

The revelation of the purpose of God will be sought first in the teaching of Christ; and it is the commission given by Him to the Church which supplies the chief incentive for the prosecution of the task. But this is not the whole of the matter. The teaching of Christ was not an isolated revelation; the way had been prepared by the dispensation of the Law and the Prophets (*cf.* Heb. i. 1 f.); and the contents of the Scriptures are the records of this Divine education of man.

The attitude of the writers of the New Testament towards the Law may be noted as an illustration of the unity and progressive character of the revelation contained in the Scriptures. St. Paul describes the Law as a *tutor to bring us to Christ* (Gal. iii. 23 f.), under which men were *kept in ward, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed*; and he speaks of Christ as *the end of the Law unto righteousness to every one that believeth*.^{*} In urging the Colossians to maintain their freedom in respect of meat, drink, feast days, new moons, and Sabbath days, he speaks of these things as *the shadow of things to come*, and adds, *but the body (i.e., the reality) is Christ's* (Col. ii. 17). Using identical language, the writer of the Epistle to the

* Rom. x. 4. *τέλος* may have the meaning of goal or purpose (cf. 1 Tim. i. 5); *i.e.*, the purpose of the Law was to lead men to Christ for acceptance with God. But more probably it has its more usual sense here of end or termination; *i.e.*, Christ has brought to an end the fulfilment of the Law (or law generally) as a means of winning favour with God (cf. Gal. iii. 10-13; Col. ii. 14).

6 HOLY SCRIPTURE THE RECORD OF

Hebrews speaks of the Law as *having a shadow of the good things to come* (Heb. x. 1; cf. viii. 5; ix. 23). St. John likewise teaches the unity and progressive character of revelation in the contrast which he institutes between the work of Moses and that of Christ: *The Law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ* (John i. 17). Truth may be the antithesis of that which is imperfect as well as of that which is false; and it is in the former sense that St. John uses the word in this passage. Compared with the revelation which was to follow, the Law was imperfect and preparatory.

There is no indication that the writer of the fourth Gospel had adopted the attitude of hostility to the Law which gained currency in sub-Apostolic times. Neither the view represented by the Epistle of Barnabas, viz., that the Jews had entirely misunderstood the Law, in insisting on a literal observance of its precepts, instead of regarding them as having only a spiritual and mystical significance, nor the view of Marcion, which

postulated opposition between the Law and the Gospel—neither of these two views is to be read into the words of John i. 17. The writer uses the expression “the Law” in its obvious and literal meaning of the system under which the Jewish Polity had grown up, and he says that that system was given by Moses.

It is difficult to believe that, after speaking of the Logos as *the true light which lighteth every man, coming into the world*, he could almost in the same breath have declared the system of Moses to have been untrue. And the language does not require it. The word *ἀλήθεια* may express the thought of truth as opposed to imperfection. It was used in this sense by Jesus when He compared worship *in truth*, not with the falsehood of heathen idolatry, but with the imperfection of the Judaistic and Samaritan conceptions of God (John iv. 23). And the frequent use in this Gospel of the word *ἀληθινός*, to express the idea of perfection, renders this interpretation of *ἡ ἀλήθεια* both obvious and natural (*cf.* i. 9 ; iv. 23 ; vi. 32 ; xv. 1).

And in thus regarding the Law as an earlier stage in the Divine education of man, the

8 HOLY SCRIPTURE THE RECORD OF

Apostles were following the example of Christ. He spake of the Law (*i.e.*, the moral Law) as being eternally binding (*cf.* Matt. v. 17-20). The principles of the commandments were of permanent obligation, and the very form in which they were expressed constituted the basis of His own moral teaching. Christ came not to destroy the Law or the Prophets but to fulfil them, *i.e.*, to give to them a fulness of meaning which they had not known before.

Even the revelation which has been given to man in Christ is only relatively perfect and final. *It is not yet made manifest what we shall be* (1 John iii. 2) is a significant admission in an epistle which is charged with repeated assertions of knowledge of the truth (see ii. 20, 27; v. 20). And St. Paul, who was so assured of the completeness of the message which had been entrusted to him that he could declare that even if an angel (or man) were to attempt to preach any other gospel he should be accursed (Gal. i. 6 ff.), could

nevertheless write: *We know in part and we prophesy in part: but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away. . . . Now we see in a mirror darkly, but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I have been known* (1 Cor. xiii. 9 ff.).

The revelation of the Christian dispensation must be distinguished from that of the Jewish, as having been *once for all delivered unto the saints*, instead of *by divers portions and in divers manners*, but it must take its place by the side of the Jewish, as being another stage in the Divine education of man, another step in the progress toward that final revelation for which the Church is still waiting.*

* It does not come within the scope of this book to enter upon a discussion of the various theories of the development of doctrine which have been propounded in comparatively recent times. But to avoid misunderstanding, the author desires to disclaim any intention of advocating the idea of the development of dogma in the Church. Theology as a science must be progressive, but there appears to the writer to be no justification for a belief in the development of the dogmas

10 HOLY SCRIPTURE THE RECORD OF

Such being the character of the revelation recorded in the Scriptures, viz., a progressive unity, we may expect to find that each new epoch in God's dealings with man had been anticipated and prepared for during the earlier stages. *Surely the Lord GOD will do nothing but He revealeth His secret unto His servants the prophets* (Amos iii. 7). And the expectation thus expressed by the Old Testament prophet is not disappointed. The intention of God to punish the wickedness of men by the Flood had been known for a hundred and twenty years before the actual event (*cf.* Gen. vi. 3, 13). The Egyptian bondage had been foretold to Abraham (Gen. xv. 13). The establishment of the Monarchy had been predicted in the promises given to the

which it is the business of Theology to express and explain. The teaching of the New Testament is not to be regarded as the first chapter, as it were, of the revelation which has been vouchsafed to the Church. It is in relation to the glory which is to be revealed with the manifestation of Christ, and in that relation alone, that the teaching of the Apostles is here spoken of as preparatory and incomplete.

Patriarchs (Gen. xvii. 6, 16; xxxv. 11).* The Babylonian exile had been made known beforehand to the prophets (*cf. e.g.*, Jer. xvi. 13-15). The Person and work of Christ had been one of the main features of Old Testament prophecy. And even the revelation of the Trinity in Unity had its anticipations in indications of plurality within the Godhead,† in spite of

* It is now frequently asserted that these statements of the Book of Genesis represent reflections upon history, which were cast into the form of prediction. If that be accepted as a true explanation, the statements cannot be regarded as illustrations of prediction. And yet it is the form, rather than the principle, of what has been said that would be affected; for a natural use of the language of prediction as a means of writing history would at least suggest that prediction had become a well-established element in the religion of Israel. For further discussion of the subject, see Additional Note at the end of Chapter II.

† See Gen. i. 26, 27; iii. 22; xi. 7; xvi. 10, 11, 13. These passages admit of other explanations, *e.g.*, the plural pronouns may be explained as "plurales majestatis," or as expressing the idea of God speaking in a council of angelic beings. Similarly, the fact that in some passages "the angel of the Lord" is identified with Jehovah, and in other passages is distinguished from Jehovah, may be explained as expressing the difference between Jehovah as He is in Himself and Jehovah as He was in those self-manifestations (see Hastings, D.B., *s.v.* Angel,

12 HOLY SCRIPTURE THE RECORD OF

the fact that the primary object of the Old Testament revelation was to impart and preserve the knowledge of God in His Unity.

The substitution of the Catholic Church in the place of the Jewish Commonwealth was no exception in this respect. Coming as it did in abrupt succession to Jewish exclusiveness, which had reached an extreme stage in post-exilic days (*cf.* John vii. 35; Acts x. 28; xi. 3), it had nevertheless been distinctly foretold (*cf. e.g.*, Psa. lxxxvii.). "It was not merely in God's counsel before its realization, but was known to men through Divine revelation." *

Hence to regard the final commission which Jesus gave to the Church as an isolated

A. B. Davidson). We cannot doubt that it is "to go beyond the understanding of Old Testament writers" to found on such passages a doctrine of distinctions in the Godhead (see Driver on Gen. xvi.); but this is not the same thing as going beyond the Old Testament; and the presence of such adumbrations of the doctrine which was subsequently revealed, would be in harmony with what we otherwise know about the progressive character of revelation.

* Orelli, *Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 124.

command is to ignore the progressive character of revelation, and to lose much confirmatory evidence that He spake those things which He had heard of the Father (John viii. 26).

The abolition of the *middle wall of partition* (Eph. ii. 14), the blending of Jew and Gentile into the one people of God, the abrogation of the law of works, and the substitution in its place of the law of faith in Christ as the way of salvation for Jew and Gentile alike, this was the "mystery" of the New Covenant, which *from the beginning of the world had been hid in God*; and though *in other generations it was not made known unto the sons of men as it hath now been revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit* (Eph. iii. 3 ff.; cf. Rom. xvi. 25 f.), nevertheless it was amongst the things which were *written in the law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms concerning Chrsit* (Luke xxiv. 44).

**PART I.—THE REVELATION IN THE OLD
TESTAMENT**

**THE PRIMEVAL AND THE PATRIARCHAL
PERIODS**

The Protevangelium.

Its primary fulfilment in Jesus, "the Son of Man."

The oracle of Noah.

The interpretation of "God shall enlarge Japhet," &c.

The promise given to the Patriarchs.

The interpretation of Gen. xii. 3.

Jacob's blessing.

The interpretation of "until Shiloh come."

Summary.

ADDITIONAL NOTE.

The predictions of the Book of Genesis.

CHAPTER II

THE PRIMEVAL AND THE PATRIARCHAL PERIODS

THAT the revelation of a world-wide evangelization, to be carried out in these latter days, should be found in the pages of the Old Testament is, as we have seen, to be expected from the consideration of the unity and progressive character of Revelation. That the expectation will not be disappointed is evident from the utterance of our Lord, recorded in Luke xxiv. 46 f., in which He gives His own command as the fulfilment of that which had been written in the Old Testament concerning Himself. To trace this revelation is therefore an essential preliminary for the due appreciation of the command of Christ,

and of the position which it ought to occupy in the thoughts and activities of His disciples.

A general survey of the contents of the Old Testament brings to light the fact that, whereas the centre of interest is one small and comparatively insignificant people, the view taken is broader, and the outlook more extensive, than the limits of the history which is selected for narration. The explanation of this phenomenon is the fact of the choice by God of a portion of the human race for special treatment, with a view to its becoming the instrument of blessing to the whole. The good of mankind is revealed as the ultimate purpose for which the choice of Israel had been made, and universal blessing is repeatedly foretold as the outcome of the special favour bestowed upon the privileged few.

The revelation takes its start in the primitive records of Primeval times, which serve as an introduction to the history.

In the story of the Fall, the sentence of

condemnation is accompanied by a prediction of the ultimate victory of the seed of the woman over the serpent. There is no allusion to the method of its fulfilment: that was in later times gradually unfolded with the development of Messianic doctrine. But the universality of the reference is unmistakable. "The Protevangelium contains a broad indeterminate prediction of a victory of humanity over the Evil Principle that had seduced man to his fall."*

From the outset the mercy of God was revealed to be world-wide in its embrace, and His purpose the victory and restoration of the race. The victory was to be given to the woman's seed, and not merely to any favoured portion of it: and He who came to fulfil the promise, came primarily as the second Adam, "the Son of Man," the representative of the race,† and only in a secondary sense as the

* Liddon, *The Divinity of Christ*, p. 79.

† Cf. Westcott on John i. 51.

Jewish Messiah, the son of David, the son of Abraham.*

It should be noticed in this connection that the title by which Jesus most frequently spake of Himself was "*The Son of Man.*"† By the use of that title He laid claim to something more than mere participation in human nature. "*The Son of Man*" is not a designation which could be properly applied to one who is

* Cf. Delitzsch, *Commentary on Genesis*, p. 163: "It is at first promised only that mankind will gain the victory. But as the promise of victory speaks of victory over the original tempter, the inference is obvious, that the seed of the woman would also be concentrated and culminate in the unity of a person, one in whom the antagonism would be enhanced to its extreme tension. But it is a mistake to think that *הוּא* has precisely a single personal meaning. The idea of *הוּא* is a circle, and Jesus the Christ or the King Messiah is the centre of the circle, ever more and more increasingly manifested during the course of the history of redemption. The first prophecy of redemption is not only the most general and most indefinite; it is also, when regarded in the light of its fulfilment, the most comprehensive and the most profound."

† In only one passage in the Gospels (John v. 27) is it recorded that Jesus used the phrase "Son of Man," without the definite article, of Himself. And there the emphasis is on His true humanity, and not on His representative humanity. See Westcott, *ad loc.*

merely a man. Nor can the use of the title be satisfactorily explained as a claim to the Messiahship. For not only does the evidence point to the conclusion that the title was not popularly understood to be Messianic,* but also "The Christ" would have been a much more obvious and effective title, if that had been the main purpose of the choice. "*The Son of Man*" is the description of one who sums up the race of men in his person, who can act for the race as its head and representative. Jesus "was not as one man among many. He was the representative of the whole race; the son of man in whom all the potential powers of humanity were gathered." †

One other indication of the Divine purpose is given in these early narratives. In the prophecy of Noah (Gen. ix. 25 ff.) there are revealed the principal features of the method by which the purpose was to be accomplished: *Blessed be the Lord, the God of Shem; and let*

* See below, Chapter VII., Additional Note.

† Westcott, *Additional Note* on John i. 51.

Canaan be his servant. God enlarge Japheth, and let him dwell in the tents of Shem, and let Canaan be his servant.

The distribution of the human family into three great divisions is here anticipated, and the descendants of Shem are singled out as the possessors of religious privileges. The use of the Covenant name, Jehovah, was an indication that they were to be admitted to a position of peculiar relationship with God. To the descendants of Japheth are assigned power and enlargement, and eventual participation in the religious privileges of Shem.

Canaan, representing the family of Ham, is doomed to subjection and servitude.

This brief utterance "carries in its bosom the germ of the history of redemption." * The election of the descendants of Shem to religious privilege was to be followed ultimately by the inclusion of the descendants of Japheth among the people of the Lord.

* Orelli, *Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 103.

According to the rendering of the Revised Version, which is here adopted, the words *let him dwell* seem to refer to Japheth. It should be noticed, however, that the testimony of the ancient versions is mainly on the side of the older rendering, which takes שֵׁם as the subject of יָשָׁב. In the Septuagint (πλατύναι ὁ Θεὸς τῷ Ἰάφεθ καὶ κατοικησάτω ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις τοῦ Σήμ) there is no indication of a change of subject; nor in the Vulgate (Dilatet Deus Japheth et habitet in tabernaculis Sem). And even if these renderings are regarded as reproducing the indeterminateness of the Hebrew, the Targum of Onkelos, representing the Palestinian tradition, is quite definite: "The Lord shall enlarge Japheth, and shall make His Shechinah to dwell in the tabernacles of Shem."

Moreover, the author of the Book of Jubilees, quoting the passage, supplies the subject: "God shall dwell in the dwelling of Shem" (vii. 12). But this testimony is not so weighty as it appears to be at first sight. The renderings of the Septuagint, the Targum of Onkelos, and the Book of Jubilees, can be easily explained as having been influenced by Jewish unwillingness to favour the idea of such free intercourse between the descendants of Shem and those of Japheth;

and it is highly probable that the Septuagint rendering of the passage helped to determine that of the Vulgate. For although Jerome claims to have made his translation from the original Hebrew, he frequently repudiates the charge of having disparaged the work of the Septuagint translators, and insists that he only diverged from them in passages where they had failed to represent the Hebrew. In his preface to the Commentary on Ecclesiastes he says: "I have translated direct from the Hebrew, adapting my words as much as possible to the form of the Septuagint, but only in those places in which they did not diverge far from the Hebrew." He expresses himself in similar language in his preface to Genesis, in the "helmeted preface" to Samuel and Kings, and in the preface to the Book of Hebrew Questions.

Another witness who may be cited is Philo. In one passage (*De Sobrietate*, c. 13) he admits the ambiguity of the words, but seems to support the interpretation which takes "God" as the subject. He notices that Noah "does not say very clearly" who is going to dwell in the tents of Shem, but "one may affirm," he adds, "that he means the Lord of the Universe;" and he then introduces the other view with a

doubtful "perhaps" (ἵσως μέντοι τὰ τῆς εὐχῆς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰάφεθ ἀναφέρεται). But against this must be set other passages in which he undoubtedly takes Japheth as the subject: *e.g.*, in his "Questions and Solutions" (ii. § 76) he explains the oracle as a prayer that "the man who has those things which are around and exterior to the body, may dwell in the house of the wise man, so that attending to the rules of all good men he may see and regulate his own course by their example."*

The view which the majority of modern scholars have adopted regards *Japheth* as the subject. This interpretation is found in the Targum of Ps.-Jon. ("The Lord shall beautify the borders of Japheth and his sons shall be proselytized and dwell in the schools of Shem"), in Justin Martyr (*Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 139), in Irenæus ("dilatans Japheth et constituens eum in domo Sem," iii. 5. 3), and in the Fathers generally. It satisfies the grammatical requirements, and avoids the abrupt introduction of a

* The older English rendering has the support amongst modern commentators of Hofmann (i. 182), Schultz (*Old Testament Theology*, ii. 347), and Briggs (*Messianic Prophecy*, p. 82).

repeated blessing of Shem in the section of the prophecy which declares the blessing of Japheth.

From these records of Primeval times we pass to the history of the Patriarchs, which begins with the call and separation of Abraham to be the Father of the chosen people.

In this period the revelation of the Divine plan was considerably developed. An individual and his descendants in a particular line* were singled out to be the recipients of blessing, including not merely numerical increase and the gift of the Promised Land, but also the privilege of Covenant relationship with God, and the direct revelation of Him and His will (Gen. xvii. 4 ff.). In the words of St. Paul, *unto them were committed the oracles of God* (Rom. iii. 2).

But this blessing of Abraham and his descendants was declared to be a means to an end, and not an end in itself. *Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from*

* Cf. Gen. xvii. 19-21, &c.

thy father's house, unto the land that I will show thee: and I will make of thee a great Nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and be thou a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and him that curseth thee will I curse: and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed" (Gen. xii. 1 ff.).

The question has been raised as to whether וְנִבְרַכְתָּ ought to be translated "shall be blessed" or "shall bless themselves." The Niphal conjugation is used again in Genesis xviii. 18; xxviii. 14: but in two passages which are otherwise similar (xxii. 18; xxvi. 4), the Hithpael is found, and that always has a reflexive sense. From this change of conjugation two different conclusions may be, and have been, drawn. On the one hand, it is urged that the two passages in which the Hithpael occurs must decide the sense of the others, the Niphal being occasionally used with its original reflexive meaning.*

But on the other hand, the difference of conjugation may be regarded as creating a presump-

* So, *e.g.*, De Wette, Gesenius, Ewald, Knobel, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Schultz, Driver, Briggs.

tion of a difference of meaning ; and in that case, where the Niphal is used, it is interpreted in its more usual Passive significance. The Passive has the support of the Targums, the Septuagint (“ἐνευλογηθήσονται” in all the passages ; see also Acts iii. 25 ; Gal. iii. 8), Ecclesiasticus xlv. 21, the Vulgate (“benedicentur” in all the passages, excepting xviii. 18, “benedicendæ sint”), Clement of Rome (c. 10), Justin Martyr (*Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 121).

If the reflexive sense is adopted, the reference must be to the use of the names of the Patriarchs by the families of the earth as types of blessedness, and to the desire to participate in their blessings. According to the other interpretation, there is a prediction of the communication of the blessings to the world at large.

In either case the thought is present of the ultimate catholicity of the people of God ; but it is more decisively expressed by the Passive.

This revelation of the Divine purpose which was given to Abraham in Haran was from time to time renewed to him (Gen. xii. 7 ; xiii. 14 ff. ; xv. 5 ff. ; xvii. ; xviii. 17 ; xxii. 15 ff.).

It was also given to Isaac (Gen. xxvi. 4) and to Jacob (Gen. xxviii. 14).

These promises to the Patriarchs established the fact that the purpose which lay behind God's dealings with them and their descendants included the eventual blessing of the whole race. The blessings of Shem were concentrated on Abraham and the promised seed, which was to consist of his descendants through Isaac and Jacob. But the bestowal of the blessing was to be a means and not an end: all the nations of the earth were to be blessed through the children of Israel.

Another stage in the revelation of the Divine purpose was reached at the close of this period in the blessing by Jacob of his twelve sons. The dying Patriarch singled out Judah as the tribe to whom the leadership should belong, and foretold the time when the sovereignty of Judah should be exercised not only over the Israelites but also over the other nations. *The sceptre shall not depart from Judah nor the ruler's staff (Law-giver, R.V. mg.)*

from between his feet, until Shiloh come: and unto him shall the obedience of the peoples be (Gen. xlix. 10).

Various interpretations have been suggested of the words "until Shiloh come," but this does not affect the unmistakable anticipation of the submission of the nations to the sovereignty of Judah. And while we cannot assert that Jacob was consciously referring to the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom, we can claim, in the light of the foregoing promises, that he was anticipating the "ideal relation of Israel to the heathen, of which the prophets speak more distinctly." *

There has been difference of opinion from earliest times as to the meaning of the word translated "Shiloh," and amongst more recent writers as to the construction to be assigned to it. Up to the eighteenth century it was unanimously regarded as the subject of the clause, but its meaning was variously explained. (1) A title of the Messiah; as such it is found first

* Driver, *Book of Genesis*, p. 413.

in the Talmud (Sanh. 98b, where it is rendered "his son"). But there is no allusion to such a title of the Messiah in any other part of Scripture, or in the Ancient Versions, or in Patristic writings. (2) A compound word = "that which (or he who) is his," or "whose it is." These renderings find support in the various Manuscripts of the LXX., and in Patristic writings (e.g., Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryph.* cc. 52, 120; Origen, *Contra Cels.* c. 53). (3) Jerome connects it with שלח (= "send"), and translates it by "qui mittendus est" (Vulgate).

These varied interpretations, which represent the judgments of antiquity, both Jewish and Christian, are unanimous in giving to the passage a Messianic sense.

The proposal to treat "Shiloh" as *accusativus loci* was made first by Teller in 1766. It is grammatically unobjectionable, but the fact that it was unknown to the ancient translators and commentators is not easy to explain satisfactorily, nor is it at all clear to what the words can refer. The period of Judah's sovereignty did not commence until the time of David, when God *refused the tent of Joseph and chose not the tribe of Ephraim, but chose the tribe of Judah, the Mount Zion which He loved*

(Ps. lxxviii. 67 f.). To get over this difficulty, מִצְחָה ("sceptre") has been regarded as denoting military power and leadership rather than sovereignty; but it is doubtful whether Judah enjoyed even "that pre-eminence in a united Israel before the reign of David."

Moreover, *the obedience of the peoples* was to be part of the manifestation of Judah's sovereignty, and while there was a primary fulfilment of that prediction in the reigns of David and Solomon, there was nothing to correspond to it before the settlement in Canaan. It seems preferable therefore to abide by the older Messianic interpretation of the passage (excluding the particular explanation which treats the word "Shiloh" as a personal title), and to regard the prophecy as having received a primary fulfilment in the days of the Monarchy, but as awaiting its ultimate fulfilment in the establishment of the universal kingdom of Christ (see Driver, *The Book of Genesis*, *ad loc.*, and *Excursus ii.*).

We are now in a position to summarize the various stages in the progress of the revelation, which are exhibited in the records of the Primeval and Patriarchal times.

1. The revelation starts with a promise given to the whole race of victory over evil.

2. The method chosen for the fulfilment of the promise is given in broad outline. It involved the election to privilege of a section of the race, with a view to a general participation in the blessings at a later time.

3. The working out of the plan began with the call of Abraham to be the Father of the chosen people, and the choice of Isaac and Jacob as the line of descent.

4. Of the descendants of Jacob, the family of Judah was marked out as the source from which one should spring who should be the instrument for the realization of the promised relation of the chosen people to the other nations of the world.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

THE PREDICTIONS OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS

THE advance of Biblical criticism has caused the question to arise as to whether the progress of revelation exhibited in the Book of Genesis represents the interpretation of history or the teaching of inspired prediction. The view has been adopted in the foregoing pages that the passages in question are predictive in character. According to the other view they are to be regarded rather as "religious reflections upon the facts of life," "prophetic interpretations of history which elicit from it the providential purposes of which it is the expression." *

* Driver, *The Book of Genesis*, p. 111.

If the book is a compilation of the Mosaic period the predictive character of the passages is indisputable, nor is it ruled out by acceptance of the modern critical analysis. The assigning of the third chapter of Genesis, for example, to a narrative "J," belonging to the ninth century B.C., does not determine the date when the story of the Fall was first produced. It is not reasonable to suppose that the Israelites were without traditions of Primeval times, or records of their past history until after the establishment of the Monarchy; nor is the age of a tradition determined by the date of the narrative which records it. And therefore, even if we accept the view that the earliest of the chief component parts of Genesis is as late as the ninth century B.C., the date of the original sources of information is still a debatable point; and we are thrown back upon the general question as to the most reasonable interpretation of the passages themselves.

Delitzsch, referring to the creation account, says, "Might not a tradition of the cosmogony have existed among men before they parted into nations and paganisms? The spirit of revelation which delivered Abraham from the bonds of heathenism would free these notions from their mythologic deformity and reduce them to the form of majestic simplicity which belief in the one præmundane and supermundane God induces. The essential matters in this account of the creation are among the most ancient foundations of the religion of Israel" (*New Commentary on Genesis*, pp. 64, 65).

Again, "We are able to separate into its component parts the fabric of the Pentateuch (Joshua included): but when we proceed to inquire when the separate elements here interwoven came into existence, we are but groping in the dark" (*Ibid.* p. 68).

Professor Briggs too, while accepting the critical analysis of the Pentateuch, regards these prophecies as ancient material which received their present order from the hands of the inspired editor. He speaks of the Protevangelium as "the only Messianic prophecy which has been preserved from the revelations made by God to

the Antediluvian world" (*Messianic Prophecy*, p. 77), of Noah, as "the aged Patriarch, inspired by the spirit of prophecy" (*Ibid.*); and in reference to the blessing by Jacob of his sons, says, "The aged Patriarch upon his dying bed, in accordance with the traditions of his family, is about to pronounce his blessing, and the spirit of prophecy comes upon him, and he utters the fourth Messianic prophecy" (*Ibid.* p. 93).

It is important to remember that acceptance of the critical analysis of the Pentateuch does not necessarily involve the denial of the predictive element in the passages which we are considering.

With regard to the oracle of Noah, there is no difficulty in seeing a correspondence between the facts of life, as they were known to the Israelites in the ninth century B.C., and the references to Shem and Canaan. God had entered into Covenant relationship with the descendants of Shem, and the Canaanites had been subjugated by them. But what are we to say about the reference to Japheth? Was there any desire on the part of the Israelites

at that time to impart their blessings to the nations of the world? Of what facts, we may ask, was the reference to Japheth an interpretation?

Similarly in connection with the blessing of Judah by Jacob, it is not easy to detect an interpretation of the facts of life in the reference to Judah's universal sovereignty. If the words were a product of the ninth century, they were written at a time when the supremacy of Judah was not even acknowledged by the ten tribes. And if they were "a comparatively late addition to the original blessing, added for the purpose of introducing into it the prophetic thought of the future rule of the ideal king," they were predictive in character.

The recognition of a predictive element in the stories of the prehistoric period does not depend upon their being accepted as the records of actual history. Even if their historical value is nothing more than that of "dim recollections of historical occurrences" *

* Driver, *Book of Genesis*, p. lxi.

they may still contain inspired prediction. A parable of Jesus is not invalidated as prediction because it is a parable, nor is the Apocalypse rendered valueless as prediction because it is written in the language of allegory.

And further, it is hard to conceive of revelation without prediction. Man needs more than interpretation of the past and guidance for the present; he needs also preparation for the future. And even if we had no record of God's earliest dealings with men, it would still be reasonable to believe that He had vouchsafed to man some indication, suited to man's condition, of His purposes. In the early chapters of Genesis we have narratives which exhibit such indications. The origin of these stories is unknown to us. But their beauty, simplicity, and spiritual value are such as to make it reasonable for us to believe that they are primitive records of revelation, and contain the earliest indications which God gave to man of His will and purpose.

THE MOSAIC PERIOD

The training of the chosen people.
Its nature and method.

Exterminating wars.

The oracle of Balaam.

“The star” and “the sceptre.”

CHAPTER III

THE MOSAIC PERIOD

BEFORE the chosen family could enter upon their mission to the world, centuries of preparation had to elapse. The first important stage in their development began with their settlement in the land of Goshen, which resulted in the laying of the foundations of national existence, and prepared the way for them to take their place as one of the peoples of the world. This preliminary stage was brought to an end through the Egyptian oppression, which reminded the Israelites that Egypt was not their home, and led to the severance of their connection with the land which was not theirs.

The next step was the renewal of God's Covenant with them at Sinai, on the basis of the revelation then given to them. By that Covenant they were made to realize their position as a *people of inheritance, a peculiar people*; and they entered as a nation upon the period of religious privilege. Before the Israelites could be the means of blessing to the world, they had to experience separation from the world.

It is not to be expected that during the period when that lesson was being specially inculcated there would be much contribution to the revelation of God's purposes of mercy for all men. The Divine love for the Children of Israel, and the corresponding obligation which rested upon them, were necessarily the leading ideas of the time. They had to learn both by precept and experience the duty and the necessity of separation, and also the deeper truths of the holiness of God and the sinfulness of man. These lessons were impressed upon them by the reward of faithfulness and

the punishment of disobedience, by moral precept and ceremonial obligation, and even by the command to exterminate the Canaanites.

A paradox seems at first sight to be involved in the conception of exterminating wars as a factor in the moral training of a nation. But it must be borne in mind that accommodation is a necessity of education. The Israelites had to learn to love their neighbours and hate their enemies, partly for the sake of the isolation without which the preparation for their subsequent mission to the world would have been impossible, and partly because the attitude of God towards sin, and particularly towards the sin of idolatry, had to be realized by them before they could be entrusted with the truth of God's love for all men. The destruction of the idolatrous inhabitants of Canaan was a necessity if the Israelites were to remain a separated people; and by making them the instruments of extermination, God impressed upon them the sinfulness of idolatry and the duty of separation.

It is not a matter of surprise that the morality of exterminating wars has been called in question,

because the tendency to judge the past from the standpoint of the present is always with us. But it must be remembered that for the Israelites no violation of moral principle was involved in the extermination of those who were the enemies both of them and of their God. If Abraham could believe that God had commanded him to offer his son as a sacrifice,¹ if Reuben could feel at liberty to offer the lives of his two sons to his father as the pledge for the fulfilment of his promise (see Gen. xlii. 37), it is not a matter for wonder that the Israelites felt no compunction about a root-and-branch destruction of peoples whose abominations were a danger to them and a dishonour to God. The fact is, there was no such conception as there is now either of the individuality of a man or of his right to his life. The absence of any clear conception of future life caused an emphasis to be laid upon the solidarity of the race, which threw into the shade the idea of the individuality of the member; and that in turn fostered the conception of a man's life as a tenancy held at the will of his fellow-men. The extermination of the Canaanites was a salutary measure, viewed from the standpoint of the welfare of the human race; and the use of Israel as the instrument was an instance of

Divine accommodation to the defective ideas of the time, for the purposes of education and progress.

The only utterance of this period which can be claimed as a contribution to the revelation of God's purpose for the Gentile nations is to be found in one of the oracles of Balaam :

*There shall come forth a star out of Jacob,
And a sceptre* shall rise out of Israel,
And shall smite through the corners of Moab,
And break down all the sons of tumult.
And Edom shall be a possession.
Seir also shall be a possession, which were his
enemies :*

*While Israel doeth valiantly.
And out of Jacob shall one have dominion,
And shall destroy the remnant from the city.*
(Numb. xxiv. 17 ff.)

The significance of the "star" and of the "sceptre" is variously explained. According to

* LXX. ἀναστήσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ Ἰσραήλ.

some, the reference is to the Monarchy as an institution. Others explain the words as referring to a specific individual, but not as being Messianic. Others again, following the unanimous interpretation of Jewish and Christian writers up to the eighteenth century, maintain that the words include a Messianic reference,* but they do not all allow that it was consciously uttered in this sense by Balaam. A parallel may perhaps be found in the words of Caiaphas, *It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not* (John xi. 50), which were interpreted as a Divinely inspired utterance, the true meaning of which was unknown to the speaker. "In virtue of his office, Caiaphas so utters his own

* According to Jewish opinion, the words had a preliminary fulfilment in David, but pointed ultimately to Messiah. The universal acceptance of the Messianic reference amongst the later Jews is evidenced by the fact that the title adopted by the Pseudo-Messiah in the reign of Hadrian was Bar-cochba ("The son of the star"). For early Christian support of the Messianic reference see, e.g., Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 106; Irenæus, *Contra Hæreses*, iii. 9. 2; Cyprian, *Testimonia*, ii. 10. See Gray, *Int. Crit. Com.*, *ad loc.*

thoughts as to pronounce a sentence of God unconsciously. By a mysterious irony he interpreted the results of the death of Christ truly, though in a way directly opposite to that which he apprehended."*

This utterance of Balaam is the only recorded prophecy of the Mosaic period which can be regarded as a revelation of the future in store for the Gentile nations, and we cannot claim that it added anything to the revelation given in the blessing of Judah by Jacob. The contribution of the period to the working out of the Divine purpose consisted, not in the growth of the revelation, but in the separation of the Israelites from the other nations, and in the preparation of Israel as the instrument through which the purpose was to be ultimately fulfilled.

* Westcott, *ad loc.*

THE PRE-EXILIC PROPHETS

The loss of the theocratic idea and the establishment of the monarchy.

The silence of Hosea, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Obadiah.

St. Paul's use of the Old Testament.

Amos.

The LXX. rendering of Amos ix. 12.

Jonah.

Joel.

The meaning of "all flesh."

Micah.

Isaiah.

Zephaniah.

CHAPTER IV

THE PRE-EXILIO PROPHETS

THE Israelites had now become a nation with a settled home: the disintegration of the period of the Judges had given place to orderly national existence, and the unrealized theocracy had been succeeded by the rule of a visible king.

The request of the people that they might have a king to rule over them signified their repudiation of the theocracy: *They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected Me, that I should not reign over them* (1 Sam. viii. 7; cf. xii. 12). Yet the request was granted: *Hearken unto their voice and make them a king.* And the

reason is not far to seek. During the days of Joshua, the people had maintained their character as a theocratic nation. They were united and organized (see Josh. xxiii. 2; xxiv. 1), and *served the LORD (Ibid. xxiv. 31)*. This state of things continued during *the days of the elders who outlived Joshua, and had known all the work of the LORD, that He had wrought for Israel (Ibid.)*. But afterwards *there arose another generation which knew not the LORD, nor yet the work which He had wrought for Israel (Judg. ii. 10)*. They fell into idolatry; and the bond of a common religion having been lost, tribal jealousy asserted itself, and a period of disintegration and disorder ensued (see Judg. v. 6-23).

In the days of Eli and Samuel, the theocratic idea had been to a certain extent revived, but any chance which it might have had of a permanent hold upon the people was frustrated by the misgovernment of Samuel's sons (see 1 Sam. viii. 1-5). Their misrule gave occasion to the deep-rooted desire of the people

for a visible king (see Judg. viii. 23; ix. 6) to assert itself. Although the people's request revealed their unwillingness to abide by the theocracy, it was nevertheless granted. There can be no doubt that the establishment of the monarchy had become a necessity for the preservation of the nation; and the granting of the request must be regarded as another instance of Divine accommodation to human weakness (see Hos. xiii. 11). And further, notwithstanding the fact that the monarchy was brought into being through the sin both of the people and of their rulers, it was permitted to play an important part in the subsequent working out of the Divine plan of redemption. The promise to David, that the throne of his son's kingdom should be established for ever (2 Sam. vii. 13, 16; *cf.* Psa. lxxxix. 4, 29, 36, 37; Isa. lv. 3), was the foundation on which was built up the prophetic conception of a Royal Messiah, whose sovereignty should be universal, and whose advent should inaugurate a reign of righteousness and prosperity. The hopes of

Israel began from this time to be definitely focussed upon a person.

With the exception of Hosea, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Obadiah, all of the Canonical prophets foretell the ingathering of the Gentiles in the latter days. The absence of reference in the writings of these four prophets can be accounted for by the nature of their mission.

Hosea was the prophet of wounded love ; his theme was the rejection of Israel on account of faithlessness and ingratitude ; and the horizon of his vision was limited to the prediction of a purified, restored, and united Israel.

Hosea i. 10, ii. 23, are quoted by St. Paul in Rom. ix. 25 f. to illustrate the grace of God in gathering to Himself a people from amongst both Jews and Gentiles.

But this use of the passages by St. Paul does not determine their original meaning. It is a feature of St. Paul's use of the Old Testament that he frequently isolates words from their context, and employs them (independently of their

original meaning) to illustrate a particular point in his argument.*

The original reference of Hosea i. 10, ii. 23, is to the Northern Kingdom. But to St. Paul the promised restoration of a people who had forfeited by faithlessness their relation to God, was the pledge of the ingathering of others who had never enjoyed such a privilege; and accordingly the words, which referred originally to Israel alone, are used by him to illustrate God's purposes of mercy towards both Jews and Gentiles alike.

Nahum, Habakkuk, and Obadiah had to announce the impending overthrow of enemies of God's people—Nahum the overthrow of Nineveh, Habakkuk that of Babylon, and Obadiah that of Edom; and it is not therefore surprising to find that the proclamation of God's purposes of love toward the world at large found no place in the message with which each was entrusted.

The concluding words of Obadiah's prophecy

* Other instances of this use of the Old Testament may be found in Rom. ix. 15, 17, 33; x. 6-8.

(*The kingdom is the LORD'S*) have been regarded by some commentators as an anticipation of the ultimate supremacy of the religion of Israel, but it seems to be more in harmony with the context to regard the words as signifying the political supremacy which Israel, as the people of the Lord, was destined to exercise over the surrounding nations.

In the Book of Amos (the earliest of the prophetic writings about the date of which there is no question), the universal sovereignty of Jehovah is strongly emphasized. He is the ruler over all the nations, and metes out punishment to all according to their deeds. Syria, Philistia, Tyre, Edom, Ammon, and Moab come under the rod of the Divine anger, equally with Judah and Israel (chaps. i. and ii.). Jehovah has dominion over Nature; drought, dearth, mildew, pestilence, locusts obey His orders (see, *e.g.*, iii. 6-10). The progress of human history, and particularly the history of Israel, is the manifestation of His government (see ii. 9-10; iv. 11). The stern character

of the prophecy is relieved by the closing message of hope. The nations are destined to become the possession of Israel. The revived and purified kingdom of David is to have dominion over a converted world. *In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old; that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and all the nations, which are called by My name, saith the LORD that doeth this* (ix. 11 f.).

The passage was quoted, as rendered in the Septuagint, by St. James at the Council of Jerusalem, as the Scriptural authority for the admission of Gentiles to the Church, without imposing upon them the obligations of the Mosaic Law (see Acts xv. 16). The Septuagint rendering of ix. 12, ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν Κύριον, may have been a paraphrase, introduced to make the sense intelligible to Greek readers (*cf.* Wordsworth, *ad loc.*); but more probably it was due to a misreading of the

Hebrew, אָרִים being read as אָרָם, and יִרְשִׁי ("they shall possess") as יִדְרְשִׁי ("they shall seek"). In either case the purport of the passage is the same, viz., that in the day of the restoration of the house of David all mankind should be admitted into covenant relationship with God.

The only other prophet of the Northern Kingdom whose name is attached to one of the Canonical writings is Jonah. The questions which have arisen respecting the date, nature, and authorship of the Book of Jonah render it impossible to make dogmatic statements about its place in the history of revelation. But this at least can be said, that, whether it be historical or pictorial, it proclaims that the Gentile world is the object of God's mercy.

The attitude of Jonah towards Nineveh, his attempt to evade the uncongenial task of being the messenger of God to that city, his complaint at the repentance of the city—these features of the story represented the fixed attitude of the Jews towards the Gentiles.

God's dealing with the prophet, His providential ordering of events so that the mission had to be accomplished, His calling of the city to repentance—these revealed the Divine love for the human race, and foreshadowed the mission of the Church to the heathen world.

Uncertainty as to date attaches likewise to the prophecy of Joel, though all are agreed that he was either one of the earliest or one of the latest prophets of the Southern Kingdom.

The passage in his prophecy which concerns us in this inquiry is ii. 28, 29: *And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out My Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions; and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out My Spirit.* The words were quoted by St. Peter on the Day of Pentecost as having received their fulfilment in the gift of tongues.

It is open to question whether the reference of the phrase "all flesh" is social or racial. Is its meaning explained and limited by what follows, or is it developed and expanded? The context certainly suggests that the promised gift of the Spirit was to be independent of social and ecclesiastical distinctions, but the words "all flesh" cannot be limited to that explanation. It is a phrase of frequent occurrence in Scripture, and there is no parallel for interpreting it as signifying all the members of a nation irrespective of social or other distinctions.* Neither the natural meaning of this phrase nor its use in Scripture seems to

* The phrase "all flesh" is used in Scripture of (1) mankind in general: *cf.* Gen. vi. 12 ff.; Numb. xvi. 22; xxvii. 16; Deut. v. 26; Job xxxiv. 15; Psa. lxxv. 2; Isa. xl. 5, 6; Jer. xxxii. 27; xlv. 5.

(2) The nations of the world as distinguished from Israel: *cf.* Isa. xlix. 26; lxvi. 16 ff.; Jer. xxv. 31; Ezek. xx. 48; xxi. 45; Zeph. ii. 13.

(3) All living creatures: *cf.* Gen. vi. 19; vii. 15; Lev. xvii. 14; Psa. cxxxvi. 25; cxlv. 21.

But there is no parallel for the limited meaning of all the members of a particular nation.

sanction its limitation in this passage to the idea of the abolition of social qualification for the exercise of prophetic ministry among the ancient Covenant people.

A parallel may be found in Isa. xlv. 3-5 : *I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and streams upon the dry ground : I will pour My Spirit upon thy seed, and My blessing upon thine offspring : and they shall spring up among the grass, as willows by the water courses. One shall say, I am the LORD'S ; and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob ; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the LORD, and surname himself by the name of Israel.* Here a gift of the Spirit is promised, which shall cause the seed of Israel to spring up amongst those who had not been called by the name of Jacob, and had not been numbered amongst those who belonged to the Lord.

It seems best then to regard the words of Joel as predicting an outpouring of the Spirit upon all nations in the latter days, together with a particular manifestation in

the bestowal upon all classes in Israel of spiritual experience and power.

The prophecy of Micah opens with a denunciation of the sins of Judah, accompanied by a warning of impending judgment and desolation (chaps. i.-iii.). But the visitation is for purification, and not for annihilation. *In the latter days it shall come to pass that the mountain of the LORD'S house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and peoples shall flow into it. And many nations shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem (iv. 1 ff.).**

* The passage occurs also, with slight variations, in Isa. ii. 2-4, where it appears to be a quotation upon which the prophet bases his exhortation. In Micah it is more complete, iv. 4 being part of it. Either Isaiah borrowed the words from

But Zion was to be more than a centre of light for the nations; she was also to be an instrument of threshing for those who should oppose themselves: *Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion: for I will make thine horn iron, and I will make thy hoofs brass: and thou shalt beat in pieces many peoples: and thou shalt devote their gain unto the LORD, and their substance unto the Lord of the whole earth* (iv. 13).

In chapter v. two further illustrations are used: the purified remnant of Jacob should be among the nations of the world as dew, in gracious benediction, and as a lion, in invincible strength (vers. 7, 8), but not until there had come forth out of Bethlehem Ephrathah He that was to be *ruler in Israel, whose goings forth are from of old, from everlasting, and who should be great unto the ends of the earth* (vers. 2, 4).

Micah, or both were quoting the words of some well-known earlier prediction.

Those portions of the Book of Isaiah which are generally accepted as the work of the prophet Isaiah, the son of Amoz (chaps. i.-xii.; xiv. 24-xxiii.; xxviii.-xxxiv.), present the same picture with greater richness of detail. Zion was to be the centre of worship and the source of revelation for the world (ii. 2). Judgment must first fall upon the kingdoms of Israel and Judah because of their corruption, but a remnant should be saved. And when the house of David had been reduced to the lowest straits, like a tree hewn down to its roots, then the *shoot from the stock of Jesse* should arise, and to Him, as armies to a standard, should the Gentiles seek (xi. 1, 10; cf. Rom. xv. 12). *The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the LORD, as the waters cover the sea. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the root of Jesse, which standeth as an ensign of the peoples, unto Him shall the nations seek; and His resting-place shall be glorious . . . and He shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts*

of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth (xi. 9 ff.).

The idea of the advent of the Messiah being the signal for the gathering of the nations to Zion finds further expression in the series of prophecies dealing with foreign nations (chaps. xiv.-xxiii.). The prophet writes of Ethiopia: *In that time shall a present be brought unto the LORD of hosts of a people tall and smooth, and from a people terrible from their beginning onward; a nation that meteth out and treadeth down, whose land the rivers divide, to the place of the name of the LORD of hosts, the Mount Zion (xviii. 7).* The oracle concerning Egypt has been described as exhibiting "the most perfect universalism, including in the salvation of the LORD Israel's mortal foe, the Assyrian."* The prophet sees in vision the time when the enmity of Egypt and Assyria towards both Israel and one another shall cease, Israel,

* Davidson, *Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 373.

the victim of both, being the instrument of union and blessing. *In that day shall there be a highway out of Egypt to Assyria, and the Assyrian shall come into Egypt, and the Egyptian into Assyria; and the Egyptians shall worship with the Assyrians. In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth: for that the LORD of hosts hath blessed them, saying, Blessed be Egypt My people, and Assyria the work of My hands, and Israel Mine inheritance (xix. 23 ff.).*

The message of the prophet Zephaniah was one of universal judgment. But behind the judgment he saw a gracious purpose: the fire would refine as well as consume; the judgment would issue in the purification of Israel and the conversion of the nations (see iii. 9, 14 ff.).

There is one utterance of Zephaniah which calls for special notice: *Men shall worship Him, every one from his own place, even all the*

isles of the nations (ii. 11). This was a remarkable addition to the prophetic conception of the latter days, indicating a distinct advance towards the realization of the future catholicity of God's people, and preparing the way for the complete vindication of the spiritual nature of true worship, which was given by Jesus in His conversation with the woman of Samaria (see John iv. 23).

**THE EXILIC AND POST-EXILIC
PROPHETS**

Jeremiah.

Ezekiel.

Isaiah, chaps. xl.-lxvi.

“The servant.”

Idolatry as the robbery of God.

Haggai.

“The desire of all nations.”

Zechariah.

Malachi.

The interpretation of Malachi i. 11.

Its use by early Christian writers.

Daniel.

“One like unto a Son of Man.”

CHAPTER V

THE EXILIC AND POST-EXILIC PROPHETS

THE prophet Jeremiah was the herald of the uprooting and destruction of nations and kingdoms, and it is not surprising that his message lacked the note of hopefulness and optimism which characterized Isaiah's forecast of the future. And yet it was not altogether absent: Jeremiah was commissioned to *build and to plant* as well as to *destroy and throw down* (Jer. i. 10); and the hope which was in store for Judah and Israel, and also for the nations of the world, finds a place in his teaching.

At that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the LORD; and all the nations shall be

gathered unto it, to the name of the LORD, to Jerusalem: neither shall they walk any more after the stubbornness of their evil heart. In those days the house of Judah shall walk with the house of Israel, and they shall come together out of the land of the north to the land that I gave for an inheritance unto your fathers (Jer. iii. 17 f.). And again, If thou wilt return, O Israel, saith the LORD, unto Me shalt thou return: and if thou wilt put away thine abominations out of My sight, then thou shalt not be removed. And thou shalt swear, As the LORD liveth, in truth, in judgment, and in righteousness; and the nations shall bless themselves in Him, and in Him shall they glory (iv. 1 f., cf. xii. 14-17).

It is true that these utterances belonged to the reign of Josiah, when the prophet had not abandoned all hope of the immediate repentance of Judah, and sought to stimulate repentance by holding out the prospect of future glory and world-wide influence. But the fact that Judah did not immediately repent cannot be permitted to invalidate these

expressions of the purpose of God respecting the Gentile nations. They are repeated in a later passage, when the prophet, after announcing the certainty of judgment because of Judah's refusal to repent, predicts the restoration from captivity: *O LORD, my strength, and my stronghold, and my refuge in the day of affliction, unto Thee shall the nations come from the ends of the earth, and shall say, Our fathers have inherited nought but lies, even vanity and things wherein there is no profit* (Jer. xvi. 19; cf. xxxiii. 9).

Ezekiel foretells the establishment of an universal kingdom of God, under the imagery of the planting of a cedar upon the high mountain of Israel, which should provide a dwelling-place for *all fowl of every wing* (Ezek. xvii. 23 f.). He foresees, as the result of the restoration of Israel, and the punishment of Israel's enemies, a widespread recognition of the sovereignty of Jehovah. *The nations shall know that I am the LORD that sanctify Israel,*

when My sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore (xxxvii. 28). And again, I will magnify Myself, and sanctify Myself, and I will make Myself known in the eyes of many nations; and they shall know that I am the LORD (xxxviii. 23). My holy name will I make known in the midst of My people Israel; neither will I suffer My holy name to be polluted any more: and the nations shall know that I am the LORD, the Holy One in Israel (Ezek. xxxix. 7; cf. ver. 23).

It must also be noticed that Ezekiel's vision of the restored people includes the admission of strangers, on terms of equality, to inheritance amongst the tribes of Israel: *And it shall come to pass that ye shall divide it (the land) for an inheritance unto you, and to the strangers that sojourn among you, which shall beget children among you; and they shall be unto you as the home-born among the children of Israel; they shall have inheritance with you among the tribes of Israel. And it shall come to pass, that in what tribe the stranger sojourneth,*

there shall ye give him his inheritance, saith the Lord God (xlvi. 22 f.). This formed a distinct departure from the earlier Law, which reserved the land for Israelites alone (cf. Lev. xxv. 10; Numb. xxxvi. 7), and expressly excluded from inheritance the Moabites and Ammonites (Deut. xxiii. 3).

The clearest and most emphatic contributions to the Old Testament revelation of the purpose of God for the Gentile nations are found in the latter half of the Book of Isaiah. The dominant theme of these chapters, which are now frequently regarded as the work of one or more unknown prophets of the Exile, is the restoration of Israel through *the Servant* of the LORD, and the consequent blessing of the Gentiles.

That the Servant is Israel is clear from such passages as Isaiah xli. 8, *But thou, Israel, art My servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham My friend*, and xlix. 3, *Thou art My servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified*.

But the conception of Israel varies. In some passages it is the whole nation (*e.g.* xli. 8); in others, the true Israel within Israel (*e.g.* xlix. 3-6).

So far there is general agreement amongst commentators; but there is diversity of opinion as to whether "Israel is further reduced to a unit, one who drew into himself all the lines of Israel's development, and was the true Israel of God fully." * Professor Davidson admits that the prophet's "conception has now received fulfilment in one in whom his idea has been fully, or more than fully, realized;" but he denies that it was the "prophet's own thought," or part of the truth which he was "commissioned to teach the people of God in his own age."

We must, however, remember that the meaning of the inspired language of the prophets is not to be limited to the sense which the writers themselves may have attached to their own words (see 1 Pet. i. 11; 2 Pet. i. 21). Their words were so "shaped and moulded by the Holy Spirit that they might grow and expand with the growth of revelation, and gather wealth in the course of ages." †

* Davidson, *Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 447.

† Kirkpatrick, *The Book of Psalms*, Introd., p. 12.

Moreover, Christ referred to certain passages of these "Servant" prophecies as requiring fulfilment in Himself : *I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in Me, And He was reckoned among the transgressors : for the things concerning Me have an end* (Luke xxii. 37). Such statements of Christ which relate to the meaning of Scripture must be distinguished from statements which relate merely to human tradition of date and authorship. In connection with the latter we may well believe that He spake in the current language of His day ; but we cannot extend this explanation to His interpretation of Scripture without calling in question the reliability of His work of revelation.

And the question, after all, which is of most importance for those who believe that the Old Testament prophets were *men who spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost*, is not what the men themselves understood to be the meaning of their words, but *what the Spirit which was in them did point unto*.

The ingathering of the nations is "depicted in full detail in a series of passages, each of which surpasses the preceding ones in glowing

enthusiasm and magnificent anticipation." * The Servant of the LORD *shall bring forth judgment (i.e., declare what is right and true) to the Gentiles* (xlii. 1); He shall set judgment in the earth, and the isles shall wait for His law (xlii. 4); He will be given for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles (xlii. 6).

In chapter xlix. the Servant complains that His attempts to bring Jacob again to the LORD have been in vain, and He receives the answer: *It is too light a thing that Thou shouldst be My servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will also give Thee for a light to the Gentiles, that Thou mayest be My salvation unto the end of the earth* (xlix. 6).

A glorious future is predicted for Zion in these chapters. Her inhabitants shall be gathered in great multitudes from the ends of the earth (xlix. 11 ff.; lv. 5): at a signal from

* Kirkpatrick, *Doctrine of the Prophets*, pp. 398 ff.

the LORD they shall be brought in the arms and carried upon the shoulders of the Gentiles (xlix. 22): the kings and queens of the earth shall be her servants, and shall bow down to her (xlix. 23): she shall be the centre of worship for all men (lvi. 3 ff.; lx. 1-14; lxvi. 19, 23): her children shall spread themselves over the earth (xlix. 20; liv. 3).

It may be true that "any direct missionary enterprises of individuals could not have occurred to the prophet," because, "like all prophets of the Old Testament, he operates with nations and peoples,"* but this relates to method and not principle. It is sufficient for our present purpose to note the fact that the prophet sets forth the conception of Zion as the centre of an universal worship, and of the Servant of the LORD as entrusted with a world-wide mission.

Another feature of these chapters which

* Davidson, *Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 400.

bears upon the subject before us is their teaching about idolatry. *I am the LORD; that is My name: and My glory will I not give to another, neither My praise to graven images.** Idolatry is here represented as a robbery of God. It is the giving to another of the glory which Jehovah has reserved for Himself.

The words of the prophet find an echo in the teaching of St. Paul: *When they knew God, they glorified Him not as God . . . and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things* (Rom. i. 21 ff.). In each case this conception of idolatry as a robbery of God finds expression in a context which speaks of world-wide instruction. In the case of the prophet, the context is that of the Servant's mission of bringing forth judgment to the Gentiles; and in the case of the Apostle, it is that of his own debt to all men because of his knowledge of the good news of Christ.

* Isa. xlii. 8; cf. xl. 18-31; xli. 21-29; xliv. 8-20; xlv. 5-7.

The connection of thought emphasizes the fact that idolatry and false worship have a Godward as well as a manward aspect. They are related not merely to the happiness and well-being of man, but also to the honour and glory of God. And consequently one of the true incentives to the preaching of the Gospel is to be found in the desire to banish from off the face of the earth that which is definitely specified as robbery of God.

The band of exiles who had returned under the leadership of Joshua and Zerubbabel had succumbed to the opposition which had been aroused by the refusal of Samaritan help in the rebuilding of the Temple; and the task of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah was to shame the people out of their complacency, and to incite them to the completion of the work. But the opposition of the neighbouring peoples was not the only difficulty with which the prophets had to contend: there was a further impediment to the enthusiasm of the

people in the insignificance of the new Temple when compared with the Temple of Solomon. Some of the people remembered the glory of the former house and bewailed the poorness of the new building (see Ezra iii. 12; Haggai ii. 3). Haggai awakened them out of their lethargy by pointing to the famine and drought, from which they were suffering, as the punishment of their indifference (Haggai i. 5-12); he confirmed them in their obedient response to his message by assurances of the Divine presence (i. 13-15); and he stirred up their enthusiasm by predicting a glory for the new Temple which should surpass that of the old. *Thus saith the LORD of hosts: Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all nations, and the desirable things of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory, saith the LORD of hosts. The silver is Mine and the gold is Mine, saith the LORD of hosts. The latter glory of this house shall be greater than the former, saith the LORD*

of hosts; and in this place will I give peace, saith the LORD of hosts (ii. 6-9).

A question arises here as to the translation and meaning of the phrase *the desirable things*. According to the rendering of the A.V. (*the desire*, which has the support of Jerome, "desideratus," Vulgate) it is a description of the Messiah. And arguing from general considerations, we must admit that nothing could be more probable than that the prophet should have introduced into his picture of the glory of the new Temple a reference to the advent of the Messiah. Moreover, the conception finds expression in Zech. ix. 9, 10, *Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold thy king cometh unto thee . . . and he shall speak peace unto the nations.*" And, in a somewhat different form, in Mal. iii. 1, *Behold I send My messenger, and he shall prepare the way before Me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His Temple; and the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in, behold he cometh, saith the LORD of hosts.*

Nor is it easy to account on any other

ground for the claim to greater glory which Haggai advances in behalf of the new Temple. Allowing for the fact that the context emphasizes material wealth, it must nevertheless be remembered that the nations brought their offerings from time to time for the building and adornment of the first Temple (*cf.* 2 Chron. ii. 16; iii. 6; ix. 1, 11, 14; xxxiii. 23), and it is hardly conceivable that the second Temple could have surpassed the first in material glory.

If this interpretation is accepted, the phrase may be explained (as a description of the Messiah) in the light of Gen. xlix. 10, Mal. iii. 1. The Messiah was, in fact, the desire of the Israelites, and he was destined to be the king of the nations; he could therefore be called by anticipation *the desire of all nations*.

But against these general considerations must be set the fact that on grammatical grounds the translation of the A.V. is open to serious objection.* The Revisers have accordingly

* מְדִינָה requires a plural subject, and accordingly the LXX. translators treated מְדִינָה as the equivalent of מְדִינֹת (ἡξει τὰ ἐκλεκτά). Dr. Sinker has suggested to me another possible rendering which satisfies the grammatical require-

adopted the rendering of the LXX., "The desirable things of all nations shall come." The import of the passage, for our purpose, is not affected by the difficulty of translation.

The worship and religion of Israel were destined to become the concern of all nations, and the new Temple was to witness the abolition of the enmity which existed between Jew and Gentile (*cf.* Hag. ii. 9 with Eph. ii. 14).

The visions of Zechariah likewise present a picture of the Temple as the centre of a world-wide worship of Jehovah. *Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion: for lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the LORD. And*

ments and does not involve any alteration of the accepted text: "I will shake all nations, and they shall come to that which (or him who) is the desire of all nations." According to this interpretation, *הַמְּבַרֵּךְ* is regarded as *accusativus loci*, and the subject of *יָבֹא* is supplied from *הַגּוֹיִם*.

many nations shall join themselves to the LORD in that day, and shall be My people (ii. 11).

The prophet vividly pictures the nations streaming to Jerusalem for worship. *Thus saith the LORD of hosts: It shall yet come to pass, that there shall come peoples, and the inhabitants of many cities: and the inhabitants of one city shall go to another, saying, Let us go speedily to intreat the favour of the LORD, and to seek the LORD of hosts: I will go also. Yea, many peoples and strong nations shall come to seek the LORD of hosts in Jerusalem, and to intreat the favour of the LORD (viii. 20 ff.).*

Israel, purified and restored, is to be the instrument for effecting this purpose. *It shall come to pass that as ye were a curse among the nations, O house of Judah and house of Israel, so will I save you, and ye shall be a blessing (viii. 13).*

In chapters ix.-xi.* Jerusalem is bidden to

* The latter part of this book (chaps. ix.-xiv.) is now very frequently regarded as the work of a different author (or authors), on the ground of the marked difference in style and contents. There is, however, at least this point of connection with the

rejoice (as in ii. 10) in anticipation of the advent of her King. When he comes he shall bring peace, not only to Ephraim and Jerusalem, but also to the nations; and his dominion *shall be from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth* (ix. 9 f.).

The circumstances portrayed in chaps. xii.-xiv. are very different, though the sequel is the same. We are introduced to a scene of warfare and destruction. The nations are gathered together in battle against Judah and Jerusalem, but Jehovah overthrows them and establishes His universal kingdom. *The LORD shall be King over all the earth: in that day shall the LORD be one, and His name one* (xiv. 9). But the nations are not annihilated; those who are left *go up from year to year to worship the King, the LORD of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles* (xiv. 16).

In that day racial privilege and ceremonial distinction shall alike be abolished. The bells earlier portion, that it exhibits the same anticipation of a world-wide worship of Jehovah.

of the horses shall have upon them *Holy unto the LORD*, every pot shall be holy, and *there shall be no more a Canaanite in the house of the LORD of hosts* (xiv. 20 f.).

Malachi's prophecy was "in the main a reproof of the sins of his contemporaries." His denunciation of the priests gives rise to a remarkable expression of one of the great truths which the Captivity experiences had brought to light, viz., that the worship of Jehovah could be independent alike of Temple and of priest. *I have no pleasure in you (i.e., the priests), saith the LORD of hosts; neither will I accept an offering at your hand. For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same My name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense is offered unto My name, and a pure offering: for My name is great among the Gentiles, saith the LORD of hosts* (i. 11).*

* These words of the prophet were regarded by some early Christian writers as a prediction of Christian worship, and

It is open to question whether the words refer to a worship which was being offered

particularly of the Lord's Supper. The author of the *Didache* refers to the Lord's Supper as "the sacrifice which was spoken of by the Lord, 'In every place,' &c." (xiv. 3, quoted by Darwell Stone, *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, vol. i. p. 50). Justin Martyr similarly quotes the words as referring to the sacrifices offered by Christians, viz., "the bread of the Eucharist and also the cup of the Eucharist" (*Dial. cum Tryph.* cc. 41, 117). So, too, Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.* iv. 17. 5, 6), Eusebius of Cæsarea (*Dem. Evang.* i. 10. 28-38), and others (see Pusey, *Minor Prophets*, *ad loc.*).

The coincidence of the quotation of these words of Malachi with the first traces of sacrificial language in connection with the Holy Communion should be noted. It suggests that the use of such language in this connection (in spite of the conspicuous absence of it in the writings of the Apostles) was due to the interpretation which was put upon the prophet's words. The belief that the Holy Communion was referred to by anticipation in the Old Testament, in sacrificial terms, seems to be the only adequate explanation of the early and frequent use of language, in reference to the sacred ordinance, which finds no sanction in the pages of the New Testament.

There can be little doubt that the interpretation was a mistaken one. Even if the predictive character of the words is admitted, it is the inner principle, and not the outward form, which has to be fulfilled. The form belonged to the time of the prophet; it was the clothing of the idea, which was determined by the circumstances and conceptions of the dispensation. It would be as reasonable to expect a literal fulfilment of the prophecy that on the bells on the horses should be

by Gentiles, or to the worship of the Jews of the Dispersion, through whom the name of the Lord was being magnified among the Gentiles. But it cannot be doubted that they speak of the actual present, and may not, therefore, in their primary meaning, be treated as a prediction of an ingathering of the nations in the future. Their significance is somewhat other than that.*

They find a parallel in Zeph. ii. 11: *men shall worship Him, every one from his place, even all the isles of the nations*. These two passages constitute the nearest approach in the Old Testament to the words of Jesus spoken to the woman of Samaria: *The hour cometh when neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem shall ye worship the Father. . . . The hour cometh and now is when the true*

Holy unto the Lord (Zech. xiv. 20), as to allow these words of Malachi to influence the conception which we form, and the language which we use, of the Holy Communion.

* See Kirkpatrick, *Doctrine of the Prophets*, p. 505, note. G. Adam Smith, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets* (Exp. Bib.), pp. 308 ff.

worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth. . . . God is spirit: and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and truth (John iv. 21-24).

This is the teaching which seems to be foreshadowed in the words of Malachi; and though they apparently contained no specific revelation of God's purpose for the Gentiles, they nevertheless set forth a principle which was inevitably destined to lead to the substitution of a catholic religion in the place of the local and national worship of Israel.

Malachi's words, uttered at a time when Jewish exclusiveness was being strongly emphasized, presented a striking contrast to prevalent conceptions. In the midst of a revived and increased sense of separation from the other nations of the world, and of a glowing enthusiasm for the preservation of national and religious privileges, the post-Exilic prophets presented to their co-religionists the picture of a time when the Temple should be a house of prayer for all nations, when worship should

be offered to the Lord in any place, when ceremonial distinctions should be abolished, and the Lord should be the God of Gentile as well as of Jew.

A discussion of the problems connected with the date and authorship of the Book of Daniel * does not fall within the scope of this book. It is sufficient for our present purpose to know that the writing had a place amongst the later contents of the Canon of the Old Testament, and that it exerted considerable influence in the growth of the Messianic hopes of Israel.†

There are two passages in the book which bear upon the subject before us.

The first is the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the great image (Dan. ii. 36 ff.). In that interpretation there

* The order adopted here has been determined by the fact that, according to the arrangement of the Hebrew Bible, the book of Daniel does not belong to the Prophetical Scriptures.

† See Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 90; Stanton, *The Jewish and Christian Messiah*, p. 211; Schultz, *Old Testament Theology*, vol. ii. p. 44; Schürer, *Div. ii.*, vol. iii. p. 53.

is a description of the rise and fall of four kingdoms. The apparently predictive character of the passage is denied by those who assign the book to the Maccabean period, the four kingdoms being regarded as the Babylonian, Median, Persian, and Macedonian.* In the words of Schultz, "The book lets the past defile before the seer in the form of visions, in order to embody it in the final age of blessedness."† But this is a point of comparative insignificance in comparison with the fact that it is generally admitted that by the *stone cut without hands, which smote the image upon its feet*, is signified the Messianic kingdom. It was to be a kingdom which should be *set up by the God of heaven*, and should destroy and supersede all the kingdoms, and should stand for ever. The actual phrases "kingdom of God," "kingdom of heaven," are not used, but there can be no doubt that the language

* See Schürer, *ibi* .

† Schultz, *Old Testament Theology*, ii. 438.

of the passage helped to lead to the use of those phrases to describe the object of hope.*

The same conception, but expressed with greater detail, is given in the vision of the four beasts and the Judgment (chap. vii.). In that vision, the imperishable dominion is given to one *like unto a son of man*.

I saw in the night visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man, and he came even to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given unto him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed (vii. 13 f.).

The phrase *son of man* as used in this passage is a description and not a title. The visions of the four beasts were succeeded by a

* See Stanton, *ibid.* p. 211.

vision of one who had the appearance of a human being.*

So far all commentators are agreed ; nor is there any doubt that the vision of the human form indicated the establishment of the Messianic kingdom. But there is diversity of opinion as to the particular reference. Was it intended to denote the person of the Messiah or the glorified and ideal people of Israel ?

In the interpretation which follows the vision, the four beasts are made to represent both kings and kingdoms (*cf.* vers. 17 and 23), and therefore the human form may have been similarly intended to denote both a kingdom and its personal head and representative.

In favour of the personal reference is the fact that, whereas in the *interpretation* the saints are depicted as being in conflict on

* Similarly in the Book of Enoch, which seems to have been based on the visions of Daniel, the designation "son of man" is frequently applied to the Messiah. In one passage (lxii. 5) the variation "son of woman" occurs.

earth with the other powers, and as suffering affliction and oppression (see vers. 21, 25), in the *vision the one like unto a son of man* is represented as *coming with the clouds of heaven*. And further, the conception of a descent from heaven to earth seems to be more in harmony with the idea of a Divinely sent ruler than with the idea of the humiliation of the people of God being changed into exaltation.

On the other hand, the interpretation of the vision attaches no particular significance to the appearance of the *one like unto a son of man*. It makes no mention of a person, but assigns the Judgment, the everlasting kingdom, and the universal sovereignty, to the people of God (see vers. 22, 27). The personality of the Messiah is left out of sight, and the Messianic kingdom is represented as the supremacy of the *saints of the Most High*.

It may seem difficult to believe that a reference to the personal Messiah was not intended, but it is more conceivable than that, if such reference was intended, no

mention should have been made of it in the interpretation.

Moreover, the vision itself does not require that the reference should be to a person. For the appearance of a human form, coming with the clouds of heaven, and not from the sea (*cf.* vers. 3 and 13), would be an appropriate emblem of the kingdom of God, as contrasted with the world powers, symbolized by the wild beasts.

According to this view, the descent from heaven is to be contrasted with the rising up out of the sea, as signifying the Divine origin of the Messianic kingdom. Nor can there be any objection to this explanation, for if the rising out of the sea is manifestly figurative, there is no reason why the coming with the clouds of heaven should not be figurative too.*

* Ancient opinion favours the personal reference : *e.g.*, the passage is directly referred to the Messiah in the Talmud ; in the similitudes of the Book of Enoch the phrases, "this son of man," "that son of man," "the son of man," are constantly used to designate the Messiah (see xlvi. 1 ff. ; xlviii. 2 ; lxix. 1, 29) ; in 2 Esdras the Son of God is represented as a man, in a vision the language of which seems to be based on this passage (see xiii. 32). Justin Martyr refers the words to

The evidential value of this prophetic teaching will be referred to in a later chapter. It will therefore suffice at this point to express the conviction that it is in such phenomena as these that an anchorage can be found when men feel themselves driven by the winds of critical controversy. Traditional views as to the date and authorship of certain parts of the Old Testament Scriptures may have to be abandoned, but nothing can weaken the significance of such prophecies as those which we have been considering, uttered under such circumstances, and receiving such fulfilment.

the Messiah (see, *e.g.*, *Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 32), but by a strange slip of the pen he quotes them in one passage as the work of the prophet Jeremiah (see *Apol.* i., c. 51). For modern support of the personal reference *cf.* Ewald, vi., pp. 112, 231; Schultz, *Old Testament Theology*, ii., p. 439; C. H. H. Wright, *Daniel and his Prophecies*, p. 170; Gould, in Hastings, D.C.G., s.v. The Son of Man.

For the other view, *cf.* Schürer, Div. ii., vol. ii., pp. 137 ff.; Driver, *Daniel*, p. 102; Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, p. 229; Stanton, *The Jewish and Christian Messiah*, pp. 109 ff., 240; Farrar, *Daniel* (Expositor's Bible), p. 249; Sanday, *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, p. 92; Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*, p. 289.

THE PSALMS

Their relation to the rest of the Old Testament,
and particularly to the Prophets.

The two pictures of the future of the Gentiles.

The primary and ultimate references.

Experience and the development of doctrine.

Summary of the Old Testament revelation.

ADDITIONAL NOTE.

The extra-Canonical Jewish writings.

CHAPTER VI

THE PSALMS

THE Psalms occupy an unique relationship to the rest of the Old Testament. They have been described as "the inspired response of the human heart to God's revelation of Himself in law and history and prophecy and philosophy."* And of these various modes of revelation there is none to which sacred poetry is more closely allied than prophecy. "Sacred poets often rise to prophetic foresight or speak with prophetic authority, while prophecy often passes into lyric poetry."†

* Kirkpatrick, *The Psalms*, p. x.

† *Ibid.*

The anticipation of the inclusion of all nations of the world in Jehovah's kingdom is an illustration in point. The emphasis which the conception receives in the writings of the Prophets is reflected in the Psalms, where it finds such frequent expression as to be one of the most striking features of the Psalter.

The various forms, too, which the conception takes in the Prophets are the forms which it also takes in the Psalms. The Prophetic picture of the circumstances under which the end would be attained is sometimes that of a battlefield: the nations are summoned to a conflict, and all that opposes itself to the will of God is destroyed. At other times, it rises to the higher plane of compassion and mercy; and the nations are invited to share in the blessings of God's people.

The same variety of conception characterizes the Psalter.

In some Psalms the nations are regarded as the enemies of God's people, before whom lie the two alternatives of submission and destruc-

tion. In others they are referred to, equally with Israel, as the object of God's care, and are depicted as turning themselves unto the Lord.

Illustration of the former line of thought will be found in the second Psalm, which describes the combination of the powers of the heathen world against the Lord, and against His "anointed;" and foretells their destruction if they persist in their opposition, for they are destined to become the inheritance of the "Son" of God. The same conception finds expression in the ninth Psalm, which appears to have been written by a king who had been victorious over some foreign foe. He accepts the experience as an assurance of Jehovah's government over the world, a government which is destined to be more fully manifested. *He shall judge the world in righteousness, He shall minister judgment to the peoples in uprightness* (ver. 8). *The wicked shall return to Sheol, even all the nations that forget God* (ver. 17).

Similar references to the manifestation of

Jehovah's sovereignty in the subjugation of the enemies of His people are contained in the thirty-third, forty-sixth, forty-seventh, fifty-ninth, and eighty-third Psalms.

The following Psalms illustrate the other, and brighter, conception of the destiny of the Gentile world.

Psalm xxii.—The manifestation of Jehovah's sovereignty in the deliverance of the writer from his distress leads to the anticipation of a time when it shall receive world-wide recognition. *All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn unto the LORD; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before Thee. For the kingdom is the LORD'S and He is the ruler over the nations* (vers. 27 ff.).

Psalm xlvii.—If the Massoretic text of ver. 9 is correct, this Psalm contains one of the boldest statements of the wider hope which are to be found in the Old Testament. *The princes of the peoples are gathered together to be the people of the God of Abraham* (R.V.). It is probable, however, that the word for

“people” (עַם) has been substituted for the preposition “with” (עִם), and that, following the LXX., we must render : *The princes of the people are gathered together, along with the people of the God of Abraham* (see Kirkpatrick, *ad loc.*). The statement then takes its place by the side of others which speak of the nations “attaching themselves to Israel in the worship of Jehovah.”

Psalm lxx.—Jehovah’s gracious dealing with His people produces the conviction that He will become the God of all the world. *O Thou that hearest prayer, unto Thee shall all flesh come* (ver. 2). *Thou art the confidence of all the ends of the earth, and of them that are afar off upon the sea* (ver. 5).

Psalm lxxi.—All the nations of the earth are bidden to see in Jehovah’s dealings with His people the manifestation of a sovereignty which is eternal and universal. *All the earth shall worship Thee* (ver. 4); *He ruleth by His might for ever; His eyes observe the nations: let not the rebellious exalt themselves* (ver. 7).

A similar thought is expressed in the sixty-seventh and sixty-eighth Psalms, in which the writer anticipates a world-wide acknowledgment of Jehovah as God, as the result of the bestowal of blessing upon Israel (see lxvii. 2 ff.; lxviii. 28-35).

Psalms lxxxvi., lxxxvii.—Zion is spoken of as the spiritual birthplace of the nations, and as their centre of worship. *All nations whom Thou hast made shall come and worship before Thee, O Lord; and they shall glorify Thy name* (lxxxvi. 9). *Of Zion it shall be said, This one and that one was born in her. . . . The LORD shall count, when He writeth up the peoples, this one was born there* (lxxxvii. 5 f.).

Psalm xciv.—The writer expresses his belief in a present universal moral government. *He that chastiseth (instructeth, R.V. mg.) the nations, shall not He correct, even He that teacheth man knowledge?* (ver. 10 R.V.).

Psalms xcvi.-xcix. — The universal sovereignty of Jehovah, manifested alike in nature and in history, calls for an universal worship.

Psalm c.—Here, as elsewhere, the manifestation of Jehovah's faithfulness towards His people is regarded as establishing a claim to the homage of the whole earth.

Psalm cii.—The writer pictures Zion as the centre of a world-wide worship (see vers. 13–22). The ultimate object of Israel's salvation is the conversion of the nations. The restoration of Israel shall be the signal for that gathering of the nations to worship the Lord which the Prophets had foretold (see Isa. ii. 2; Mic. iv. 1).

Psalms cxvii., cl.—These Psalms of praise summon Creation to a universal worship of Jehovah. *Let everything that hath breath praise the LORD.*

It is not necessary to deny that such passages as those which have been quoted, or referred to, had a primary and historical sense, in relation to the circumstances under which they were written, in order to believe that they contained within themselves a meaning which was not wholly intelligible in the age in which

they were written, and that they were not completely fulfilled in the events to which they immediately referred. In the light of subsequent revelation we believe them to be the inspired utterances of the Divine plan, which, while eternally one, has nevertheless been gradually unfolded alike in history and in revelation.

An interesting point which emerges from the study of the Psalms is that experience was the chief factor in the inspired enrichment of the writers' conceptions. Jehovah's dealings with the nation had been such that it was no longer possible to conceive of Him as concerning Himself only with the interests of His chosen people. The manifestations of His power and providential ordering of circumstances left the writers no option but to believe in His universal sovereignty, which in the course of time could not fail to receive universal recognition. It was only another step to recognise that the nation was destined to be the instrument of a world-wide mission.

A parallel instance of the development of belief amongst the Israelites through the experiences of life may be found in the gradual acceptance of the idea of future life. The sufferings of godly men and the prosperity of evildoers undermined the conception of punishment and reward being limited to life on this side of the grave, and led to the belief in a hereafter, when the justice of God should be more fully manifested. The pious Israelite sought in various ways for a reconciliation between the accepted view of life and the facts of experience before he abandoned the idea that the grave was the end of all that could be truly called life. He believed that the prosperity of the wicked would be short-lived, while the reward of the righteous would be sure and abiding (Psa. xxxvii.); he insisted on the impotence of wealth as contrasted with Jehovah's care for the righteous (Psa. xlix.); he regarded true happiness as consisting in fellowship with God rather than in worldly prosperity (Psa. lxxiii.); he anticipated a

meting out of reward and punishment in posterity (Psa. cix.). But these were only gropings after the truth. And although in the Old Testament Scriptures there are no indications of any widespread belief in the doctrine of future life as we understand it, yet individuals had fought their way to the conception, and in our Lord's time the belief had so far established itself as to become a dividing factor between the two most important sections of the people (Matt. xxii. 23; Acts xxiii. 8). It was along a similar pathway of experience that the Psalmists reached their conception of an universal worship of Jehovah. The Psalms in which the idea finds most emphatic expression are those which celebrate God's power in nature and His dealings in history. He who is the Eternal Creator must receive the homage of all His creatures; He who manifested His sovereign power in the preservation of Israel must be the God of all the nations of the earth.

To sum up the witness of the Old Testament Scriptures, we may say that from the earliest times the underlying purpose of God's dealings with men was revealed to be the bringing of all nations of the earth unto *the obedience of faith*.

This purpose required for its accomplishment the adoption and training of a particular nation, to whom the revelation should be entrusted which was ultimately to be made known unto all men.

During the period of the training, in which the chosen people occupied a position of peculiar relationship to God, to the apparent exclusion of the other nations, the counsel of God lay hidden and unrecognised until the time of the Prophets. It had been made known to the Patriarchs, but seems to have made no impression upon the thought of their more immediate descendants.

The Prophets, in spite of the traditions and environment produced by centuries of Divinely ordered exclusiveness, brought the Divine

purpose to light again, and foretold the "foundation of a spiritual kingdom which should know no limits of race or country or class or space or time, uniting all men in an equal fellowship of blessing and privilege and hope." *

* Kirkpatrick, *Doctrine of the Prophets*, p. 523.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

THE EXTRA-CANONICAL JEWISH WRITINGS

BEFORE passing from the evidence of the Old Testament Canon to that of the New, it will be of interest to notice the attitude towards the Gentiles adopted by the writers of the Apocrypha and Jewish apocalyptical literature. We do not look to them as being channels of revelation. They have not commended themselves as such to the judgment of the Church. But we may expect to find in them an index of Jewish opinion, and an illustration of Jewish thought, as it manifested itself towards the close of the Old Dispensation and at the commencement of the New.

In the Apocrypha the Messianic hope is not

prominent. Schürer* claims to have found in Ecclesiasticus all the essential elements of the prophetic teaching; but apart from a reference to the covenant with Abraham and Isaac, introduced for the purpose of extolling their memory (Ecclus. xlv. 19 ff.), there is no allusion to the ingathering of the nations, which was one of the main features of the older teaching. It seems to be nearer to the truth to say that "only the vaguer Messianic hopes—if they are to bear the name—find expression"† in the book. The most distinct references are to the coming of God's wrath upon the heathen, and to the hope of deliverance for Israel.‡

The Book of Tobit contains the only clear and independent statement of the wider hope which is to be found in the Apocrypha: *Many nations shall come from far to the name of the Lord God with gifts in their hands, even gifts to*

* *Hist. of Jewish People*, vol. ii., p. 138.

† Stanton, *The Jewish Messiah*, p. 111.

‡ See chaps. xxxvi. 1-17; xxxix. 23; l. 24.

the King of heaven ; all generations shall praise Thee with great joy (Tobit xiii. 11); and again, *All nations shall turn, and fear the Lord God truly, and shall bury their idols* (xiv. 5 f.). This prediction is based on the teaching of the Prophets, but there is no mention of the Messiah.

The author of the Book of Judith refers to the judgment which is in store for the nations which rise up against God's people (Judith xiv. 17); but here again there is no mention of the Messiah, nor any indication of an expected ingathering of the Gentiles.

We must not, however, think that the conception of the Prophets had been quenched by the legalism of the later age. For not only can the silence of the Apocrypha be accounted for by the historical and gnomic character of the writings, but also "Daniel and the apocryphal books written in imitation of it were certainly much more read in Israel than the other moralising, but somewhat insipid, books

of the Apocrypha."* It was not until the first century B.C. that the picture of mercy and hope for the Gentile world became faint and indistinct in the Messianic conceptions of the Jews. Abundant traces of it are found in the Jewish documents of the second century B.C.

In the Sibylline Oracles,† the advent of the Messianic King is referred to as the occasion of a rising up of the heathen nations against God's people. But it shall be in vain. God will destroy them and protect His people. Then shall be peace; and the heathen, when they see God's care for His people, will turn to praise God; they will send gifts to His Temple, and accept His Law. The eternal and universal

* Schultz, *Old Testament Theology*, ii., p. 443; see also Ewald, *History of Israel*, vi., pp. 113, 231.

† In the third century B.C. Greek poetry began to be pressed into the service of the religion of Israel. The practice was at first confined to the celebration of historical events, but later it was extended to the teaching of the truths of the sacred books. See Stanton, *The Jewish Messiah*, pp. 42 ff., 114; Ewald, *History of Israel*, v., pp. 261 ff.; Edersheim, *Life of Jesus the Messiah*, ii., pp. 655 ff. (ed. 1900).

kingdom of God shall then be established (*e.g.*, Sib. Or., iii., 616 ff., 710 ff.).

The two most strongly emphasized points in this section of the oracles are the acceptance by all nations of the Law of God, and the setting up of an eternal kingdom of God over all men. It should also be noticed that the image of the Divine King, which is obscure in Daniel, gains clearness in these later writings, which follow out the same line of thought, and is presented with ever-increasing glory.*

In the Apocalypse of Enoch there is a similar vision of judgment, of the restoration of Zion, and of the consequent conversion of the nations (Enoch xc. 20–37).

The author of the Psalms of Solomon expresses confidence in the fulfilment of God's promise to David of an eternal kingdom. The nations shall come from the end of the earth to see the glory of God. They will bring as gifts those who had oppressed Israel, and they, too, shall be ruled by the righteous King.

* *Cf.* Westcott, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 90.

There shall be mercy for all the nations that come before God in fear (xvii. 5-38).

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs represent a work of the second century B.C., with Jewish additions of the first century B.C., and Christian interpolations. The author was imbued with the universalism of the Prophets. "The salvation of the Gentiles belongs to the very texture of the book."* *The Lord shall visit all the Gentiles in His tender mercies for ever* (T. Lev. iv. 4). A new priesthood would be established for Gentiles as well as for Israel (cf. T. Lev. viii. 14). *All the peoples shall glorify the Lord for ever* (T. Jud. xxv. 5). *His name shall be in every place of Israel, and among the Gentiles* (T. Dan. vi. 7). *God shall appear on earth to save the race of Israel, and to gather together the righteous from amongst the Gentiles* (T. Naph. viii. 3). *He shall save Israel and all the Gentiles* (T. Ash. vii. 3). *The twelve tribes shall be gathered there (i.e., in the*

* R. H. Charles, *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Note on T. Ben. ix. 2.

Temple) *and all the Gentiles* (T. Ben. ix. 2). *God shall reveal His salvation to all Gentiles* (T. Ben. x. 5).

The Book of Jubilees, which is now regarded as a document of the second century B.C., was the link between the severer aspect of the teaching of the Prophets and the legalistic Judaism of the following century. Belonging to the same period as the Testaments, it represents a widely sundered view on this and other questions.

The Prophets' picture of the destiny of the Gentiles met with the same fate as their teaching about the Messiah met with at the hands of the authors of this and similar writings. The Messianic teaching of the Prophets presented two apparently discordant elements; and, through the neglect of the one, the other was so exaggerated that the Jews failed to recognise Him who reconciled them in His Person and work. In a similar manner, the Prophetic picture of the Gentiles exhibited two apparently contradictory representations of

their destiny; and of these, later Judaism, in the main, developed the one and neglected the other.

The Book of Jubilees was the second century representative of this one-sided treatment of the Prophetic teaching. It is characterized by an extreme Pharisaism. The law is gloried in as an eternal ordinance, the separation of Israel is insisted on, and the Gentiles are denounced. The nations are regarded as having "spirits in authority" placed over them to lead them astray; but for Israel no angel or spirit is appointed, because God is their leader and preserver (see, *e.g.*, xv. 31).

This harsher view of the destiny of the Gentiles became prevalent in the first century B.C., and is almost universal in the writings of later Judaism.* A study of the writings which appear to have been contemporary with those of the New Testament, *e.g.*, the Apoca-

* See R. H. Charles on *Apoc. of Baruch*, lxxii. 4; *Eschatology*, pp. 160, 305; *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Introd., p. xevii.

lypse of Baruch, the Fourth of Esdras, the Assumption of Moses, enables us to compare the natural product of Judaism with the teaching of the Apostle of the Gentiles,* and to appreciate his assertion that he owed his gospel to the direct and immediate revelation of God.

In the Apocalypse of Baruch, it is true, there is a strain of hope for the Gentiles: *I will scatter this people among the Gentiles, that they may do good to the Gentiles* (i. 4). But it is a very partial hope. It extends only to those who have not known Israel; destruction awaits those who have ruled over the Israelites or known them. *He will summon all the nations, and some of them He will spare, and some of them He will slay. These things therefore will come upon the nations which are to be spared by Him. Every nation which knows not Israel and has not trodden down the seed of Jacob, shall indeed be spared. And this because some out of every nation will be subjected to My people.*

* See below, Chapter IX.

But all those who have ruled over you or have known you shall be given up to the sword (lxxii. 4-6).

The Fourth of Esdras exhibits a narrow Jewish exclusiveness without modification or relief. There is no hope at all for the nations. They shall be gathered together against God's Son, and shall be destroyed (see chap. xiii.).

The idea presented in the Assumption of Moses is that the world was created for the sake of the Jews*; but a revelation of the fact was not given, in order that the Gentiles might be put to shame by their own reasonings on the subject; nothing but punishment awaits the Gentiles (see i. 12 f.; x. 7 ff.).

These illustrations of the attitude of contemporary Judaism show what a distance the prevailing thought of our Lord's day had travelled from the teaching of the Prophets, and reveal the nature of the gulf which separated His own teaching from that of the

* Note the contrast between this conception and that of St. Paul, as expressed, *e.g.*, in Rom. xi. 12.

Pharisees. The latter, it is true, were spoken of by Jesus as being exceedingly zealous in making proselytes; but their activity was prompted and determined by motives which called down upon it His severe denunciation (Matt. xxiii. 15). We may be certain, therefore, that they were not actuated by any honest desire to see the Gentiles brought to the knowledge of God. There is, it is true, a conspicuous instance in the Gospel records of a Jew of our Lord's time, who was a true son of the larger-hearted Old Testament Prophets. Simeon was looking for a revelation which was to be given to the Gentiles, as well as for the consolation and glory of Israel (Luke ii. 25 ff.). But Simeon was an exception. The piety even of Zacharias did not rise above the conception of salvation as the spiritual and political deliverance of Israel, and the fulfilment of the promises given to the Fathers (Luke i. 68 ff.).

**PART II.—THE REVELATION IN THE NEW
TESTAMENT**

THE PUBLIC MINISTRY OF CHRIST

The difference of attitude before and after the Resurrection.
Christ's refusal to be made known both by men generally and
by the disciples.
The mission of the Twelve, and of the Seventy.
The reason for this attitude.
The one exception.
Two illustrations of Jesus' attitude towards the Gentiles in
particular :
 The mission of the Twelve.
 The ministry in Tyre and Sidon.
 Ewald's explanation.
Direct intimations of the approaching change.
Anticipations in general teaching.
The expansive character of Christ's public ministry.
Summary.

ADDITIONAL NOTE.

The Son of Man.

CHAPTER VII

THE PUBLIC MINISTRY OF CHRIST

THE attitude of Jesus towards the proclamation of Himself underwent a striking change after His Resurrection. It was not merely in the matter of preaching to the Gentiles that the difference was manifested, though that was the principal feature, but there was also a marked change in His attitude towards the preaching of Himself generally. The charges delivered to the Apostles and others in the course of the public ministry stand out in strong relief in this respect from the commission given to the Church during the forty days which elapsed between the Resurrection and the Ascension.

During the period of public ministry, Jesus habitually forbade men to make Him and His works known: *See thou tell no man* was the charge given to the leper who had been cleansed (Matt. viii. 4; Mark i. 44; Luke v. 14); *See that no man know it* was the similar charge given to the two blind men whose sight had been restored (Matt. ix. 30); the multitudes who had witnessed Jesus' works of healing were commanded not to make Him known (Matt. xii. 16); silence was enjoined upon the unclean spirits who knew who He was (Mark iii. 12); those who were present at the raising of Jairus' daughter were told to let no man know it (Mark v. 43).

Upon the disciples, too, a similar restriction was imposed. On the occasion of the confession by St. Peter of belief in His Messiahship, Jesus charged them *that they should tell no man that He was the Christ* (Matt. xvi. 20; Mark viii. 30; Luke ix. 21); and after the Transfiguration, *as they were coming down from the Mount Jesus commanded them, saying, Tell*

the vision to no man, until the Son of Man be risen from the dead (Matt. xvii. 9; Mark ix. 9). The addition of these last words revealed the fact that the restriction was not to be a permanent one: they were an anticipation of the time when the prohibition would be superseded by a positive command to tell all men. St. Luke's narrative exhibits an interesting coincidence with those of St. Matthew and St. Mark. He does not relate the actual words, but in his description of the subsequent attitude of the Apostles he seems to be unconsciously describing the effect which the words had upon their action: *They held their peace, and told no man in those days any of the things which they had seen* (Luke ix. 36).

The fact of the mission of the Twelve seems at first sight to suggest some modification of the impression which the passages just quoted give of Jesus' pre-Resurrection attitude towards the preaching of Himself. But it is important to notice that the Apostles were not told to

proclaim Him or His works. Their message was, *The kingdom of heaven is at hand* (Matt. x. 7; Luke x. 9); they were also bidden to *heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils*. Their mission was preparatory : they were to be heralds of the kingdom, and to prepare men, by the mighty works which they should perform, for the reception of the Gospel. But this was not the same thing as the preaching of the Gospel itself. St. Mark's summary of their message is, *They preached that men should repent* (Mark vi. 12)—a clear indication that they were sent to prepare the way for Jesus rather than to preach Him.

It is true that St. Matthew's account of Jesus' charge to the Twelve includes a reference to the necessity of confessing Him before men (Matt. x. 32); but it is probable that the evangelist is here following his characteristic method of grouping his material without particular regard for historical setting. The words in question occur in a part of the discourse which

obviously refers to later times (*cf.* the allusion to persecution, vers. 17 ff.), and which is placed both by St. Mark and St. Luke at the close of the public ministry (see Mark xiii. ; Luke xxi.).

The mission of the Seventy is to be regarded in the same light. Their message and credentials were identical with those of the Twelve (Luke x. 9), and the preparatory character of their ministry is stated in express terms: *After these things the Lord appointed seventy others, and sent them two and two before His face into every city and place whither He Himself was about to come* (Luke x. 1).

We conclude, therefore, that the fact and nature of the missions of the Twelve and of the Seventy do not require any modification of the conception which we have formed of the pre-Resurrection attitude of Jesus towards the proclamation of Himself.

The reason for this attitude is not far to seek. It is to be found in the circumstances and purpose of His mission. The Incarnation had as its end more than the life of perfect

obedience and the death on Calvary. The mission of Jesus also included the revelation of God and the founding of the Church. But an extensive popular movement could only have had the result of bringing that ministry to a premature termination. For the general acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah would have been based on the mistaken conceptions which the Jews had formed as to the Messiah's mission, and this would have involved Roman interference.* The course which events would have taken can be seen in the sequel to the feeding of the five thousand. On that occasion the belief that Jesus was *the prophet that should come into the world* actually led to the attempt to take Him by force and make Him a king; and Jesus was compelled to leave them, and to depart into the mountain alone (John vi. 14 f.).

It is true that the fourth Gospel frequently mentions the fact that the circumstances of Jesus' life were so providentially ordered that no man laid

* Cf. Cairns, *Christianity in the Modern World*, p. 194.

hold on Him until His hour was come ; * but it is the same Gospel which also emphasizes the exercise of caution and prudence on the part of Jesus,† and tells of a submission to His Father's will, which was so complete that even the refusal to manifest Himself in answer to the taunts of His brethren was a deliberate carrying out of the ordered plan of His life : *My time is not yet come. . . . I go not yet up to this feast, because My time is not yet fulfilled* (John vii. 6 ff.).

Further illustration of the necessity for this temporary accommodation to circumstances is afforded by the case of the leper, whose disregard of the charge to say nothing to any man resulted in Jesus being unable any more to openly enter the city, and being compelled to dwell without in desert places (Mark i. 45 ; Luke v. 15).

One occasion, however, is recorded on which Jesus charged a man to make Him known ; but this exception only confirms the explanation

* See John vii. 30, 44 ; viii. 20 ; xii. 27 ; xvii. 1 ; cf. Luke xxii. 53.

† See John iv. 1, 3 ; vii. 1 ; xi. 54.

which has been given of the general rule. The restored Gerasene demoniac was bidden to go to his home and tell them how great things the Lord had done for him (Mark v. 19 f.). But there was a special reason for this. The Gerasenes had requested Jesus to depart out of their coasts, and consequently the necessity for silence had been removed. Jesus therefore left amongst them the man whom he had healed, to be a witness in a district where there was no danger of His own ministry being impeded by a popular rising, and to prepare the way for His later visit (vii. 31 ff.).

In addition to this refusal of notoriety in general, we must notice also Jesus' attitude towards the Gentiles in particular. Of this there are two conspicuous illustrations.

When Jesus sent forth the Twelve, He bade them confine their ministry to the Jews: *Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel* (Matt. x. 5 f.). The other illustration was con-

nected with Jesus' own ministry. In answer to the request of His disciples that He would rid Himself and them of the Syro-Phœnician woman's company by granting her petition,* He based His temporary rejection of her on the ground that He was *not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel* (Matt. xv. 24).

As before, so now the explanation of this apparently exclusive attitude lies ready to hand in the circumstances of Jesus' ministry. The time was not ripe for the problem to arise of the admission of Gentiles into the Church. For Jesus to have received them into the company of the disciples, on the recognised conditions for the admission of proselytes to the Commonwealth of Israel, would have been to sanction the Church being permanently organized on the basis of the Jewish Law; while to have ignored those conditions would have been effectually to discredit His mission in the eyes of the Jews.

* The reply of Jesus suggests the idea that the disciples' request, "Send her away," was the equivalent of "Grant her petition."

The restriction, therefore, of the ministry both of Himself and of the Apostles to the Jews was a necessary, though temporary, accommodation to circumstances.

Ewald * suggests that the prohibition to preach to Samaritans and heathen was due to the consideration of Jesus for the Twelve. He supposes that the questions involved were too formidable for them to face, and the treatment required by such districts was too difficult for them to attempt, and that Jesus therefore thought it better to let them make trial of their difficult office in districts, and under conditions, with which they were more familiar. But the facts seem to point to something more than this as lying behind the prohibition. They suggest that the policy of Jesus was determined not merely by consideration for the Twelve, but also by the requirements of His own mission. The fact of the correspondence of His own action, where such inability to face the problems cannot be thought of, shows that the charge to the Twelve represented in this respect the general policy of the public ministry.

* *History of Israel*, vol. vi., p. 325.

In spite, however, of this pronounced refusal of public proclamation, and side by side with this direct repudiation of mission to the Gentiles, there are distinct indications that Jesus was continually thinking of the near future, when this attitude should undergo a complete change. He constantly anticipated the commission, which was given during the forty days, both by direct intimation and also indirectly by general teaching.

There were direct intimations. At the beginning of the Galilean ministry Jesus aroused the indignation of the congregation in the synagogue at Nazareth by reminding them of the ministry of Elijah to the woman of Sarepta, and of Elisha to Naaman the Syrian—illustrations of God's care for the heathen world (Luke iv. 25). In commending the faith of the centurion at Capernaum, Jesus said: *I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And I say unto you, that many shall come from the East and from the West, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom*

of heaven; but the sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness: there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth (Matt. viii. 10 f.). On a later occasion, while teaching in one of the synagogues, Jesus used similar language (Luke xiii. 28 ff.). In speaking of Himself under the imagery of the Good Shepherd, He said: *Other sheep I have which are not of this fold* (αὐλῆς): *them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice, and they shall become one flock* (ποίμνη), *one Shepherd* (John x. 16). The application of the lesson of the parable of the husbandmen included the statement: *The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof* (Matt. xxi. 43). On the occasion of the second cleansing of the Temple, Jesus justified His action by a quotation from Isaiah lvi. 7: *My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations* (Mark xi. 17). In both St. Matthew's and St. Luke's accounts the words *for all the nations* are omitted, and in St. Mark's account they are a natural continua-

tion of the quotation, and appear to have no particular emphasis laid upon them; but the mere fact that Jesus appealed to one of the passages in the Prophets which pictured, in the boldest fashion, the Temple as the centre of an universal worship was a significant anticipation of the issue of His ministry. Even more suggestive were the words spoken in defence of the woman who anointed Jesus' head: *Verily I say unto you, wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which this woman hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her* (Matt. xxvi. 13; Mark xiv. 9). But the most definite and emphatic of these intimations was given in the teaching about the last things: *This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations; and then shall the end come* (Matt. xxiv. 14). *The gospel must first be preached unto all the nations* (Mark xiii. 10).

In addition to such direct intimations of what was in Jesus' mind with regard to the Gentile nations, we can see also in much of His general

teaching anticipations of a world-wide preaching. He laid down principles which were inevitably destined to break down the barriers which divided Jews and Gentiles. In the Sermon on the Mount He took no account of racial or ceremonial qualifications for membership of the kingdom: the kingdom was to belong to the poor in spirit; the earth was to be inherited by the meek; God was to be seen by the pure in heart; mercy was to be obtained by the merciful. So, too, in the conversation with the woman of Samaria He set forth requirements for the worship of God which were such as to render obsolete the conceptions of Jew and Samaritan alike as to worship being more acceptable in one place than in another.*

Moreover, Jesus' teaching about the conditions for obtaining the Divine forgiveness, and for entering into the possession of eternal life,

* Worship "in spirit and in truth" is here contrasted, not with ceremonial worship, but with the idea that God was more specially present and accessible in one place than in another. The words do not in their context relate to the presence or absence of ritual in worship.

was universal in its reference. The conditions were such that all men could fulfil them; and the teaching was frequently introduced by such general terms as *whosoever will, whosoever believeth, whosoever drinketh*.

The statements of Jesus about the purpose of His manifestation had the same universal reference: *God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son* (John iii. 16); *God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world, but that the world should be saved through Him* (*ibid.* iii. 17); *The bread which I will give is My flesh, for the life of the world* (*ibid.* vi. 51); *I am the Light of the world* (*ibid.* viii. 12); *I am come a Light into the world, that whosoever believeth on Me may not abide in darkness* (*ibid.* xii. 46); *Thou gavest Him authority over all flesh that, whatsoever Thou hast given Him, to them He should give eternal life* (*ibid.* xvii. 2).

While considering the indirect anticipations of a world-wide evangelization, we must not overlook the significance of the title which Jesus most frequently used of Himself. It

was not as "the Christ," or as "the son of David," or as "the King of Israel," that He was accustomed to speak of Himself, but as "the Son of Man." He selected a title by which He could repudiate the narrow exclusiveness of current Messianic thought, and could claim relationship to mankind in general.*

But it was not in word only that Jesus prepared the disciples for the change which was coming. His ministry was marked by an expansive character which was a foreshadowing of the ever-widening sphere of activity set before the Church in the last words which He spake before the Ascension: *Ye shall be My witnesses both in Jerusalem and in all Judæa, and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth* (Acts i. 8).

The public ministry of Jesus began in Jerusalem with the first cleansing of the Temple (see John ii. 13 ff.).† After a short stay there,

* See below, Additional Note.

† The miracle at Cana is not here included in the public ministry, because it partook rather of the nature of a

during which *many believed on His name*, Jesus went with His disciples into the land of Judæa (John iii. 22). The ministry there was of sufficient duration for Him to make even more disciples than the Baptist (John iv. 1, 2). Then, on account of the attention of the Pharisees having been drawn to His work (and the account implies that their motive was hostile), Jesus left Judæa and passed through Samaria. He sojourned there for two days and preached to the Samaritans, many of whom believed on Him (John iv. 39-41). From Samaria Jesus went into Galilee, and commenced the prolonged ministry, the account of which occupies so large a space in the Synoptic Gospels.

That Galilean ministry must be noticed in the present connection for two reasons: (1) its missionary character within the borders of Galilee; (2) the short visit towards its close to the borders of Tyre and Sidon.

preliminary and private revelation vouchsafed to disciples and friends.

The missionary character of the Galilean ministry is one of its prominent features. Capernaum became the headquarters from which Jesus made frequent visits to the neighbouring cities and villages. On the occasion of the first of these missionary circuits, the disciples expostulated with Jesus for leaving the enthusiastic multitudes: *All men seek for Thee*, was their astonished cry (Mark i. 37); but His answer was, *Let us go elsewhere into the next towns, that I may preach there also; for to this end came I forth* (see Matt. iv. 23; Luke iv. 43). Records of similar evangelistic tours are found in Luke viii. 1; xiii. 22. In this constant reaching out after towns and villages where the Gospel had not been preached, we can see a foreshadowing of the expanding mission of the Church.

The visit to the borders of Tyre and Sidon was made towards the close of the Galilean ministry, when the popular excitement aroused by the feeding of the five thousand, together with the vehement opposition organized from

Jerusalem, had made a temporary withdrawal from Galilee necessary. This visit is the only recorded contact of Jesus with the heathen world. There is no indication in the Gospel narratives that it was the occasion of any general ministry, but it is not unreasonable to suppose that the purpose was something more than the relief of one individual's distress. There were many in Israel whose needs were as great as those of the Syro-Phoenician girl. It requires, therefore, no great stretch of imagination to see in the visit the last stage in a deliberate expansion of the sphere of ministry, an anticipation of the Church's mission to the uttermost parts of the earth.

The conclusion, then, that we draw from the records of Jesus' public ministry is, that before the Resurrection (for reasons partly revealed in the Gospels, and partly to be conjectured from our knowledge of the circumstances under which the ministry was accomplished) Jesus maintained the traditional Jewish attitude of exclusiveness: but that His

ministry exhibited an expansive character, which was a foreshadowing of the very course which He set before the Church in His last words to His Apostles; and in His teaching He both laid down principles which were destined eventually to make Jew and Gentile one, and also gave direct intimations that the time would come when the Gospel should be proclaimed in all the world.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

THE SON OF MAN

THE view has been adopted in the foregoing pages that the primary purpose for which Jesus made choice of the title "The Son of Man" was to signify and emphasize His relationship to mankind in general, as the representative of the race, rather than to Israel, as the Messiah. The truth of this explanation depends very largely upon the answer which must be given to the question as to whether the title was generally recognised as Messianic; for, if so, it could not have been dissociated from current Messianic thought, and its significance would have been determined by that association.

There are two passages of peculiar importance for the inquiry.

In the first place, the question which Jesus put to the Apostles in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea Philippi seems to suggest that the title was not understood by them to be Messianic. *Who do men say that the Son of Man is?* (Matt. xvi. 13) could not have received the answer, *Some say John the Baptist; some, Elijah: and others, Jeremiah, or one of the Prophets*, unless the Apostles had understood Jesus to be alluding to Himself. If the question had signified "Who do men say that Messiah is?" that answer would have been impossible. Men might have thought of the Baptist as being Messiah, but they could not have thought of Messiah as being "Jeremiah, or one of the Prophets." Moreover, the question which follows, *but who say ye that I am?* shows clearly that Jesus was referring to Himself.* Hence we conclude that the A.V. of Matt. xvi. 13 gives the only possible sense,

* Cf. the parallels, Mark viii. 27, Luke ix. 18.

though it does not represent the best text (cf. R.V.).

If, then, "the Son of Man" was a recognized Messianic title, we must suppose that Jesus gave the Apostles the alternative either of accepting His own designation of Himself as Messiah or of directly contradicting Him;* and this at a time when He was bringing to a point a spontaneous recognition of the truth which had been gradually dawning upon their minds in the course of their discipleship. The idea is at variance with the general conception which the Gospels present of the method which Jesus adopted for revealing Himself.

The other passage is John xii. 34, *The multitude therefore answered Him, We have heard out of the law that the Christ abideth for ever: and how sayest Thou, The Son of Man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of Man?* Two directly opposite explanations have been given of these words. On the one hand, it has been

* See Stanton, *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*, p. 242.

maintained that the Jews understood "the Christ" and "the Son of Man" to be synonymous titles.* On the other hand, emphasis has been laid upon the question, *Who is this Son of Man?* as indicating that the hearers were perplexed by the use of the title.† The latter view appears to be the true one. The Jews knew by this time of Jesus' claim to be the Messiah, and they are here attempting to show that He had overlooked an important element in the Messianic teaching of the Old Testament. It is not necessary to regard their words as, on the one hand, spoken in mockery, or as, on the other hand, representing earnest inquiry. His hearers had evidently been attracted by the raising of Lazarus (vers. 18, 19), but they were moved by a spirit of curiosity rather than of discipleship (ver. 37), and consequently they were more ready to argue than to learn. In their argument they made

* Cf. Schürer, ii. 67; Hastings, *D.C.G.*, s.v. *The Son of Man*, Gould.

† Cf. Stanton, *ibid.*, p. 240.

use quite naturally of the title by which Jesus had spoken of Himself in their hearing (ver. 23); and having stated what they believed to be the inconsistency between His prediction of His death and the prophecies of the Old Testament, they turned their attention to the title and asked Him to explain it. The question suggests that they were in doubt as to its meaning.

In addition to the evidence of these two passages, the fact must be taken into account that, whereas Jesus studiously avoided, during the earlier part of His ministry, any public and open declaration of His Messiahship, He frequently spake of Himself as "the Son of Man." The fact seems to be capable of explanation only on one of two grounds. Either the title had no generally recognised Messianic import or it was inserted in the narratives at a later date. But in the latter case the question may well be asked, How and when could the insertions have taken place? At what period could the

records of the life of Jesus have been thus tampered with? It is difficult to conceive of its having been done while the teaching of Jesus was fresh in the recollections of men. And it is even more difficult to regard it as a still later insertion, because the title seems to have fallen into very early disuse. The only place where it is found in the New Testament, outside the records of the words of Jesus Himself, is the account of the vision of St. Stephen.* Its occurrence outside the New Testament is also infrequent.

The absence of the title in the Epistles has been made the ground by some writers for supposing that it was a late insertion in the Gospels. But even if such an alteration of the cherished records of the Church could be explained, the idea seems to lose sight of the fact that there is no evidence to show that the title ever came into current use. The

* Acts vii. 56. The phrase occurs twice in the Apocalypse, but in each case as a description and not as a title, based apparently upon the vision of Daniel (Apoc. i. 13; xiv. 14).

more probable explanation is that it was not regarded as adequately, and for all purposes, expressing the conception of Christ which the Resurrection and Ascension had impressed upon the minds of His followers. Associations of majesty it doubtless had for the Jews, but for the Gentiles it would have had no such significance, and might have led to a veiling of the truth that Jesus was primarily and eternally the Son of God. In other words, its presence in the Gospels is a striking witness to the fidelity of the records, and its absence in the epistles and later writings indicates the widening range of the Church's appeal beyond the confines of Judaism.*

We conclude, therefore, that the intention of Jesus in the use of the title was not primarily the assertion of His Messiahship. The fact that in Daniel's vision the emphasis is laid upon "the humanity of the form which is invested with eschatological splendour," † and

* See Stanton, *ibid.*, p. 244.

† See Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*, p. 239.

the additional fact that the picture of ideal humanity presented in the eighth Psalm is the source of the terms "Son," "Son of Man," as applied to Jesus by St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 28), and by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 6), suggest rather that Jesus selected the title to signify and emphasize His claim to be the fulfiller of man's destiny, the representative and Head of the human race. From this point of view the definite article has the extremely important function to perform of distinguishing the title of Jesus' choice from the phrase "son of man," which was frequently used of the Prophets. Both have this in common, that they signify membership of the human race; but whereas "son of man" is merely a synonym for man, and could be applied to all alike, "the Son of Man" implies representative humanity, and could only be applied to one.

Those who hold this view are not compelled to regard the title as devoid of all Messianic association. It is merely in respect of popular

recognition that the association appears to be rendered impossible. The intermediate position adopted by Professor Sanday* illustrates the compatibility of the two conceptions. He maintains that while the central idea of the title was the relationship to humanity, it had also a Messianic significance which was known only within a small circle. Professor Denney† too, while asserting that the title had a Messianic import as it was currently used, allows that Jesus may have used it on occasion "with an emphasis which brought out another part of its contents." He speaks of it as "always charged with the idea of humanity, as well as with that of final sovereignty." Whatever measure of doubt there may be as to the exact emphasis which ought to be laid upon the Messianic significance of the title, there can be no hesitation in accepting the position that "it betokens an infinite sense

* *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, pp. 92 ff.

† *Jesus and the Gospel*, p. 289.

of brotherhood with toiling and struggling humanity,"* and that by its use Jesus claimed to be the Saviour not of Jews only but also of the whole race of men.

* Sanday, *ibid.*, p. 97.

THE TEACHING OF THE FORTY DAYS

Two marked features of the records :

Absence of general information.

Fulness in one particular.

The diversity of the accounts due, in part, to the repetition of the command.

The principle of selection.

St. Matthew. Jesus and the kingdom.

St. Mark. Jesus and the individual.

St. Luke. Jesus and the world.

Two other features :

(1) The position assigned to the evangelization of the world.

(2) The ground on which it is based.

St. John. Jesus and the Church.

The account in Acts.

The last utterance.

The gift of the Spirit for the purpose of witnessing.

ADDITIONAL NOTE.

The commission of John xx. 23.

CHAPTER VIII

THE TEACHING OF THE FORTY DAYS

DURING the short period which elapsed between the Resurrection and the Ascension, the ministry of Jesus was confined to the disciples (Acts i. 2 f.; x. 40 f.; 1 Cor. xv. 5-7). From time to time in the course of those forty days He appeared to them, and particularly to the Apostles, to whom He spake of "the things concerning the kingdom of God." Whatever view is taken of the meaning of the phrase "the kingdom of God" in Acts i. 3, it cannot reasonably be doubted that the teaching of those forty days included instruction about the work of the Church.

The records of that teaching exhibit two marked features.

On the one hand, they are extremely scanty. We may well believe that the instruction then given has found expression in the actions and teaching of the Apostles; but the fact remains that the contents of the actual records fall very far short of what we might have hoped for and expected.

On the other hand, in one particular the records are surprisingly full, viz., in the statements of the Church's mission to the world, which are found in varying forms in each of the four Gospels and in the Acts of the Apostles. The significance of this fact can best be appreciated by remembering that there are in the Gospels only two accounts of the birth and early years of Jesus, three of the temptation, two of the Sermon on the Mount (*i.e.*, if we identify the contents of Matt. v. with passages in Luke, chaps. vi., xiv., xvi.), three of the Transfiguration, three of the institution of the Lord's Supper, and three of the Ascension.

When we recall these phenomena of the

Gospel narratives, and, further, when we compare the fulness of reference to the Church's mission with the scantiness of the record of the other teaching of those forty days, we need not hesitate to claim that the command to evangelize the world has received a remarkable emphasis.

It matters not for our immediate purpose whether we regard this fulness of record as the direct consequence of Divine inspiration, or as the natural product of impressions conveyed to the minds of those who listened to the teaching; in either case the same conclusion forces itself upon us, viz., that the one dominant and absorbing theme of the teaching of the Risen Christ, the one subject of paramount importance, was the commission which He entrusted to the Church to preach the Gospel unto the uttermost parts of the earth.

Passing to the study of the various accounts, we find that they exhibit considerable diversity; and the question arises, whether the variations are to be regarded as those which

would naturally characterize different records of the same circumstances, or as being due to the fact that the commission was given in different forms at different times, and that each writer selected for narration the particular form which best suited his purpose.

According to St. Matthew's account the commission was given in Galilee, where Jesus appeared to the disciples by appointment (xxviii. 16). The eleven Apostles alone are mentioned as being present, but this does not exclude the possibility of disciples having been gathered there with them. The fact that the meeting had been appointed by Jesus renders it probable that as many as possible came together. Moreover, the words οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν, which may be rendered "but others doubted" (*cf.* οἱ δὲ in xxvi. 67), can hardly be regarded as referring to the Eleven. There is nothing improbable in the doubt of disciples, who had not before seen the Risen Lord, and had come to the gathering because of the report of others; but it is extremely unlikely that any

of the Eleven still remained in doubt after their experience (and particularly that of St. Thomas) in the upper chamber at Jerusalem. Furthermore, there was some well-known occasion on which Jesus appeared to *above five hundred brethren at once* (1 Cor. xv. 6), which may well have been this meeting in Galilee, since special importance must have been attached to that event, on account of its having been anticipated once in the message of the angel to the women on the Resurrection morning (Matt. xxviii. 7), and twice by Jesus Himself (*ibid.* xxvi. 32; xxviii. 10). But although it may be incapable of strict proof that the company gathered together on this occasion included more than the eleven Apostles, it is at least certain that the day was subsequent to the day of the Resurrection; for on that evening the two disciples on their return from Emmaus found the Eleven gathered together in Jerusalem (Luke xxiv. 33), and eight days elapsed after the Resurrection before St. Thomas saw the Risen Lord (John xx. 26).

The account given in St. Mark's Gospel appears to be part of an appendix which was added to its original form.

In the two great fourth-century Bibles which have come down to us,* the Gospel ends at xvi. 8 ; there was a shorter alternative ending in early circulation ; and the internal characteristics distinguish xvi. 9-20 from the rest of the Gospel.† Dr. Salmon ‡ argues in favour of the Marcan authorship of the section, attributing the difference in style to the possibility of the evangelist having ceased at xvi. 8 to compile his recollections of St. Peter's teaching, and of his having added the remaining verses from his own knowledge. Professor Swete maintains that the adverse evidence is too strong, and regards the verses as belonging to another work, whether that of Aristion (mentioned by Papias as one of the disciples of the Lord, Eus., *H. E.*, iii. 39),§ or of

* Codex Sinaiticus (א), and Codex Vaticanus (B).

† See Swete, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, Intr. c. xi.

‡ See Salmon, *Introduction to New Testament*, p. 151.

§ The name of Aristion was suggested by the discovery, made in 1891 by Mr. F. C. Conybeare, of an Armenian MS. of the Gospels, written A.D. 986, in which the last twelve verses

some unknown writer of the first century. Whatever view be adopted, there can be no doubt that the verses were a very ancient addition, for before the end of the second century ver. 19 was quoted by Irenæus as a true part of the Gospel.* The uncertainty as to the authorship of the verses does not depreciate their value as containing authentic narrative.

According to this account, Jesus, after appearing to the two disciples as they were going into the country, joined the Eleven as they sat at meat.

This brings the narrative into line with that of St. Luke, who tells us that after the appearance to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, Jesus appeared to the Eleven and others gathered with them in Jerusalem, and partook of food with them (xxiv. 15 ff.). We

of St. Mark are introduced by a rubric written in the first hand, "Of the presbyter Ariston." The conjecture depends upon the identity of this Ariston and the Aristion mentioned by Papias. See Swete, *ibid.*

* "In fine autem evangelii ait Marcus *Et quidem dominus Jesus. . .*"—*Adv. Hær.*, iii. 10. 6.

conclude, therefore, that the records contained in the second and third Gospels of the occasions on which the last command was given refer to the same event, viz., a gathering of the Apostles and others in Jerusalem on the evening of the day of the Resurrection.

The form of the commission given in the fourth Gospel (xx. 23) is quite different from those of the Synoptic Gospels, but the occasion must be identified with that which we have just been considering. It is definitely stated to have been the evening of the day of the Resurrection (xx. 19) when the disciples were assembled at Jerusalem.

The only remaining record is that given in Acts, which relates to an entirely different occasion from those previously alluded to. The time was the day of the Ascension, and the place was the Mount of Olives (i. 12).

Summing up the evidence of the five records, we find that the commission to evangelize the world was given to the Church by Jesus after His Resurrection at different times and in

different places. It was given in Jerusalem on the day of the Resurrection; it was given in Galilee on some occasion subsequent to that day; and it was given on the Mount of Olives on the day of the Ascension. We therefore maintain that the divergencies of form are not to be entirely explained as the natural product of more or less independent accounts of the same event, but as due, in part at least, to the repetition of the command by Jesus in various forms and on various occasions.

But we can go further than this, and say that in each of the records that particular form of the command was chosen which was most in keeping with the guiding principle of the writer. That there was such a process of selection at work, which determined the general character of each of the Gospels, is obvious. It is seen in what each writer has chosen to include in his narrative, and even more in what each has chosen to omit. The writer of the fourth Gospel not only claims to

have made such a selection, but also specifies the purpose which he had in view: *Many other signs did Jesus in the presence of the disciples which are not written in this book: but these are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in His name* (xx. 30, 31). And when we compare the particular form of the last command which is recorded by each writer with what appears on other grounds to have been the guiding principle of the narrative, the conclusion seems to be reasonable that the diversities of form are to be accounted for by such a theory of selection. In other words, the explanation of the differences is not that the substance of one statement of Jesus was expressed by each writer in language of his own selection, but that of the different forms in which Jesus at different times gave the commission, each writer selected the one which was best adapted to the underlying purpose of his narrative.

St. Matthew, guided throughout by the con-

ception of Jesus as the Christ, the Messianic King, gives the form of the last command which corresponded to that conception: *And Jesus came to them and spake unto them saying All authority hath been given unto Me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world* (xxviii. 18-20).

Jesus is here represented as the King, possessed of all authority, commanding His followers to gather all nations into His kingdom. The honour of the King rather than the happiness of the individual is the prominent thought. The world-wide dominion must be manifested; the sovereignty of Jesus must be universally acknowledged; His commands are to be universally obeyed.

In St. Mark's Gospel the conception changes; it represents an entirely different standpoint

from that of St. Matthew. Jesus is depicted throughout as the Son of God walking on this earth in man's nature and for man's sake, and manifesting His power in works of love and mercy.

The form of the last command selected by St. Mark (or by some early writer who had caught his spirit) corresponds to this ruling idea. The disciples are bidden to carry the good news to every creature. Each individual is the object of the Divine love, and each is to have the opportunity of listening to the offer of salvation. The Gospel closes with the statement that He who had manifested His gracious power, while on earth, for the happiness of men continued to do so after His Ascension, *the Lord working with* the little band who went forth to preach in obedience to His word. The picture presented is that of the Son of God working out, as the Son of Man, man's salvation.

St. Luke is the prophet-historian ; his accurate history of Jesus' earthly life and ministry is

tinged throughout with the thought of the future progress of the Church. The universal character of Christianity receives frequent emphasis and illustration.* The Gospel was "the former treatise" which served as a preparation and introduction to the writer's further work in which he outlined the gradual expansion of the Church, and traced the steps which led to the realization of the universalism of the Christian religion. The ministry of Jesus was viewed by St. Luke as an epoch in the history of the world, demanding careful study and narration, and destined to exert a world-wide influence.

There was a form of the last command which harmonized as fully with this ruling idea as those narrated in the first and second Gospels did with theirs:

* It will suffice, for the purpose of illustrating the point, to notice that St. Luke's account of the birth of Jesus includes the story of the shepherds, with the angel's message of the birth of the *Saviour* (Luke ii. 10 ff.). Compare with this St. Matthew's choice of the incident of the Magi, with its emphasis on the birth of the *King* (Matt. ii. 1 ff.).

Then opened He their mind that they might understand the Scriptures; and He said unto them, Thus it is written that the Christ should suffer and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem (xxiv. 45-47).

The idea presented by the words is that of a critical epoch in the ordered plan of the world's history—an epoch which had been foreseen and foretold, and which was to result in the orderly expansion of the Church from the centre of Judaism unto the furthest bounds of the earth. The same conception of ordered development underlies the other account of St. Luke given in Acts i. 8: *Ye shall be My witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.*

There are two other features of the record contained in the third Gospel which call for special attention.

In the first place, there is the position which is assigned by Jesus to the evangelization of the world. Three predictions in the Old Testament picture of the latter days are mentioned by Jesus as requiring fulfilment, viz., the Death of Christ, the Resurrection of Christ, and the preaching of repentance and remission of sins unto all the nations. The evangelization of the world is ranked by the side of, and on the same level with, two of the greatest facts of the Christian creed. The three are represented, not as independent and disconnected predictions, but as parts of a whole, the three together constituting the main elements of the Old Testament picture. When Jesus spake the words two out of the three predictions had already passed into the realm of fact; the third still awaited fulfilment, and was assigned to the Church to carry out in the power of the Pentecostal gift. We need not, therefore, plead guilty to a blind following of an uncritical age, if we accept the fulfilment of the two parts of the

176 TEACHING OF THE FORTY DAYS

Old Testament prediction as the pledge that in God's time the third will be as surely fulfilled.

In the second place, the ground upon which Jesus here bases the necessity for the evangelization of the world is the fact that it was written in the Old Testament Scriptures. The commission itself was new, but it was given by Jesus as the fulfilment of prophecy. It was the climax in the revelation of the Divine will which had started with the story of the Fall, and had been gradually growing clearer through the utterances of Old Testament Prophets. With this may be compared the language of St. Peter in his address to Cornelius and his company: *To Him bear all the Prophets witness, that through His name every one that believeth on Him shall receive remission of sins* (Acts x. 43).

The form of the commission recorded in St. John's Gospel is not explicit as to the sphere in which it was to be executed, but the universalism underlying it is unmistak-

able: *Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained* (xx. 22, 23).

It is the form in which the spiritual significance of the Church's mission is most clearly set forth. The Church is in the world for the remitting and retaining of men's sins. Like her Master, she was sent into the world for judgment (*cf.* iii. 19; xx. 21). Upon the response which is made to her ministry depends the life or the death of men (*cf.* 2 Cor. ii. 16). And this is the conception which runs through the fourth Gospel. The writer makes no claim to give a complete record of the life of Jesus. The references to the external history are (with the exception of the account of the Passion) just sufficient to act as a framework for the doctrinal teaching. The main body of the Gospel consists of a carefully selected series of discourses and miracles by which Jesus revealed Himself to be the light and life of men. He is the

Eternal Son and the Incarnate Word, who has been working in creation from the very beginning; He who was manifested in flesh was the Creator of all things (i. 3), the source of life and light for all men (i. 4-9); He was manifested that all men might believe (iii. 16); to all that believe in Him He gives the right to become sons of God (i. 12); He was sent into the world that the world through Him might be saved (iii. 17); and He gives the Spirit that the world through Him may be brought to a knowledge of the truth (xvi. 8).

The general conception which is suggested by such statements as these is that the human race was beset by sin and darkness; its fundamental need was that of a Saviour who would bring light and life; the Saviour has come in the person of the Incarnate Son of God; and the work of the Saviour is made effective in the lives of men through the mission of the Spirit and the operations of the Church.

And with this conception the form of the commission recorded in xx. 21 ff., with its

implicit universalism and its spiritual significance, exactly harmonizes. Jesus, the Author of life and peace, sent into the world by the Father, now sends into the world His Church, and bestows upon her the gift of the Spirit for the ministry of the remitting and the retaining of men's sins.*

Reference has been already made to the form of the commission given in the Acts of the Apostles as being one which would specially appeal to a writer whose guiding principle was simply that of making an accurate record of the progress of the Gospel. It was the form which was best fitted to act as a prelude to the history of the early development and expansion of the Church.

There are two other features of this saying of Jesus which may be noted here.

In the first place, it was His last utterance before the withdrawal of His visible presence: *When He had said these things, as they were looking, He was taken up* (Acts i. 9). Last

* See Additional Note at the end of this chapter.

words always have a solemnity attaching to them, and particularly when they are spoken by a leader to a group of faithful followers. How much more must this be the case with the last words of Him who came to be *the way, and the truth, and the life*. Furthermore, seeing that they took the form of a solemn and definite charge, it must be admitted that they impose upon the members of the Church an obligation of no ordinary importance.

In the second place, we notice the connection which the utterance establishes between the gift of the Spirit and the work of witnessing: *Ye shall receive power when the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be My witnesses*. There is no justification for isolating the promise, and making it independent of willingness to fulfil the obligation. A parallel may be seen in St. Matthew's account of the commission given on the mountain in Galilee: *Go ye into all the world . . . and lo, I am with you all the days*. Here, again, the promise of the presence of Jesus must not be

separated from the purpose with which He Himself connected it. Jesus promised to be with His disciples in their efforts to make disciples of all the nations, and the fulfilment of the promise must be regarded as conditioned by willingness to fulfil the obligation. The ideal which here and elsewhere in the New Testament is set before the Church is that each member has a ministry to perform (*cf.* Eph. iv. 12), and to each the Holy Spirit distributes His gifts, as He wills, for the purpose not of selfish enjoyment but of the building up of the Body of Christ (*cf.* 1 Cor. xii.).

ADDITIONAL NOTE

THE COMMISSION OF JOHN XX. 23.

THE particular bearing of the words of the commission, as recorded by St. John, upon the subject of our inquiry has been already pointed out. There are added here some considerations which should be borne in mind for a right understanding of their more general import.

1. The words were addressed to a company of Apostles and disciples, and not to the Apostles by themselves (*cf.* the parallel account in Luke xxiv. 33). In other words, the commission was given to the Church as a whole, and not to any particular body of men within the Church. In the words of Bishop Westcott,

“The commission must be regarded properly as the commission of the Christian society, and not as that of the Christian ministry;” * and of Professor Swete, “Like the wider authority to bind and loose, the forgiveness of sins is committed to the Church collectively. But presumably it may be exercised, like the larger power, by individual members of the Church who by official position or character, or both, are qualified to speak in the name of the Christian society.” †

2. The words must be considered in their relation to the earlier promise recorded in Matt. xviii. 18. Of that promise Professor Swete says: “To bind and to loose is a well-known Rabbinical formula, meaning to prohibit and to permit. It is used in connection with the judgments pronounced upon questions of religion and morality by individual scribes

* Westcott, *ad loc.* See also Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 33.

† *Report of Fulham Conference on Confession and Absolution*, p. 5.

or by great schools of Rabbinical teaching," and he concludes that by the use of these words Jesus "committed to His Church, the new Israel, the office which was claimed by the synagogue of acting as arbiter and judge in all questions of religious truth and error, right and wrong." * The promise of John xx. 22 f. relates to a particular application of this power. The scope of the promise is limited to that which is purely spiritual. "It gives a living and abiding power to declare the fact and the conditions of forgiveness." †

3. The pronouns are in the plural number (*τινων, αυτοις*), indicating that "the gift and its refusal are regarded in relation to classes rather than to individuals." ‡

4. The manner in which the commission was discharged must be determined by the description of the Church's ministry given in Acts and in the Epistles. There is no sanction

* *Report of Fulham Conference on Confession and Absolution*, p. 4.

† Westcott, *ad loc.*

‡ *Ibid.*

for the idea that it was by an absolute individual exercise of the power of "retaining" and "remitting" sins;* the commission was discharged by the ministry of the Word, both in public and in private (including particularly the authoritative declaration of the fact and conditions of forgiveness), and of the Sacraments (*cf.* 2 Cor. ii. 15-17).

5. The gift of the commission to the Church as a whole does not involve the right of any and every individual member to exercise it. On the contrary, the fact that it was given to the whole Church requires that it shall only be exercised by those whom the Church authorizes to do so.†

* See Westcott, *ad loc.*

† *Cf.* Westcott, *The Revelation of the Risen Lord*, Preface to the 2nd edition, p. xx.

**THE MINISTRY AND TEACHING OF
ST. PAUL**

The conversion.

St. Paul and the older Apostles.

The preparation for St. Paul's work.

 The baptism of Hellenists.

 The appointment of the deacons.

 The work of Philip.

 St. Peter and Cornelius.

The Council of Jerusalem.

St. Paul's emphasis on the Divine origin of his apostleship.

His use of *μυστήριον*.

The moral government of the world.

All things to be summed up in Christ.

St. Paul's conception based on his vision of the Glorified Christ.

The necessity for St. Paul's conversion, in the light of a comparison between his attitude towards the Gentiles and that of contemporary Judaism.

CHAPTER IX

THE MINISTRY AND TEACHING OF ST. PAUL

THE conversion of Saul of Tarsus was an event which was directly connected, through the revelation which followed it, with the accomplishment of the purpose of God for the Gentile world. The inner meaning of that experience on the road to Damascus was first declared to St. Paul by Ananias (*cf.* Acts ix. 15 and xxii. 15). Subsequently, three years after the conversion, his knowledge of the Divine intention was confirmed by direct revelation in the Temple (Acts xxii. 21). The fullest statement of the commission which he received is contained in the record of the Apostle's defence before Agrippa: *I have*

*appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people and from the Gentiles unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in Me ** (Acts xxvi. 16-18). This was "the heavenly vision" to which St. Paul was not disobedient, which was impressed for life upon his mind, and which guided the whole of his future course.

In respect of this commission, the mental

* St. Paul introduces these words in the speech before Agrippa as though they formed the actual communication of the Divine will made to him on the road to Damascus; but from a comparison of the accounts given in Acts ix. and xxii., it appears that he received the message first through Ananias at Damascus, and subsequently by direct revelation in the Temple. We conclude, therefore, that he is here summarising the communications which came to him, in consequence of his conversion, on various occasions.

perception of St. Paul stands out in sharp contrast from that of the original Apostles, who, in spite of the definite and repeated statements of Jesus, seemed unable at the first to rid themselves of their traditional attitude towards the Gentiles.*

St. Peter, it is true, in his discourse on the day of Pentecost, bore witness to the catholicity † of the Church: *To you is the promise, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto Him* (Acts ii. 39); but in the light of his subsequent conduct at Antioch (see Gal. ii. 11), it is extremely doubtful whether he had entered fully into the meaning of his own words.

Again, in his address to the Jews after the healing of the lame man, he reminded them of the promise made to Abraham, that in his

* Cf. Ewald, *History of Israel*, vi. 288; Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 37.

† The catholicity of the Church is spoken of here and elsewhere in this book in its original meaning of the universality of the Church, as knowing no limits of race or clime.

seed all the families of the earth should be blessed (Acts iii. 25); but it was only through the experience at Joppa that his prejudices were sufficiently overcome to make him willing to preach the Gospel to the company of Gentiles in the house of Cornelius (Acts x. 28).

It is also true that *James, Cephas, and John*, on perceiving the grace that was given unto Paul, gave to him and Barnabas *the right hands of fellowship*, that they should go unto the Gentiles; but it was apparently accompanied at the time by an unwillingness to take such a responsibility upon themselves (see Gal. ii. 9 f.).

It is worthy of note, too, that at the Council of Jerusalem St. Peter seemed to assign the beginnings of his own perception that the Gentiles had a right to the Gospel to the time of his experiences at Joppa and Cæsarea: *Ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among you that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the heart,*

bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as He did unto us; and He made no distinction between us and them, cleansing their hearts by faith (Acts xv. 7-9). Up to that time St. Peter had "failed to comprehend the wide purpose of God."*

Moreover, the absence, in the record of the Council, of reference to the command of Jesus is remarkable. The impression conveyed by the utterances of St. Peter and St. James on that occasion is that experience had forced them to a certain conclusion which they found to be consistent with Old Testament prophecy.

* See Lightfoot, *Galatians, Essay on St. Paul and the Three*, p. 300. Hort's view, that the older Apostles were merely waiting for the Divine monition that the time had come for them to carry out that preaching among the Gentiles "which it is incredible that they should ever have dismissed from their minds," appears to the writer to underestimate the significance of St. Peter's vision at Joppa, and of the reference which he made to it at the Council of Jerusalem. The sacred narrative seems to suggest that the mere contemplation of the admission of the Gentiles, as such, to the Church was something new and startling to the Apostle; and that he accepted it as the revealed purpose of God on the ground of that experience. See Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, pp. 85 ff.

The teaching of Jesus is not so much as mentioned. It seems difficult to explain the omission on any other ground but that they had for the time failed to understand His words.

Further confirmation of this general failure on the part of the older Apostles is found in the fact that, prior to the ministry of St. Paul, there was no *spontaneous* attempt to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. Indeed, the believers at Jerusalem seem to have been content to stay there until all, except the Apostles, were scattered abroad by circumstances over which they had no control (see Acts viii. 1, 4). Then, but not till then, they *went about preaching the word*; but even so, with the exception of Philip's mission to the Samaritans, it was *to none save only to Jews* (Acts xi. 19).

If in Acts xi. 20 "Ἑλλήνας is read instead of 'Ἑλληνιστάς,* we must conclude that there

* The evidence of the early MSS. is inconclusive.

Σ = εὐαγγελιστάς—obviously a blunder, due to the influence

were some who ventured to preach the Lord Jesus to Gentiles at Antioch, but, even so, it is clear that they were the exception to the general rule.

With this evidence before us, we can hardly avoid the conclusion that from the point of view of the initiation of the great work which lay before the Church, the choice of Saul of Tarsus meant the passing over of the Twelve. Failure on the part of the Church was met by the raising up of a man who, though he had been a persecutor and blasphemer, nevertheless had the will and the capacity to grasp

of the following word *εὐαγγελιζόμενοι*, and intended for 'Ελληνιστάς. B = 'Ελληνιστάς. A = "Ελληνας; but this testimony of A is weakened by the fact that "Ελληνας is found also in Acts ix. 29, where the reference cannot be to heathen Greeks. D = "Ελληνας.

Westcott and Hort = 'Ελληνιστάς. R.V. = "Ελληνας.

The internal evidence seems to favour "Ελληνας. For (1) the term that would be naturally used to distinguish Jews from Greek-speaking Jews is 'Εβραῖοι and not 'Ιουδαῖοι as here (*cf.* Acts vi. 1); (2) the action of the men of Cyprus and Cyrene is spoken of as something new, whereas Greek-speaking Jews had already an established footing in the Church.

the Divine plan so soon as it had been made known to him.

But although it was mainly through the work of St. Paul that the expansion of the Jewish Church into an universal Church was effected, there were other influences at work as well which must be taken into account.

The baptism of Hellenist Jews on the day of Pentecost must have resulted in the purging of the new truth "of some local encumbrances which would gather about it in the mother-country, and in the carrying of it thus purged to far-distant shores."*

Then the appointment of the deacons gave to the Hellenist members a status in the Church, and was a step of far-reaching consequences. For not only are the names of the Seven Greek, "pointing to Hellenist rather than a Hebrew extraction," but also "two out of the Seven stand prominently forward as the champions of emancipation—Stephen the

* See Lightfoot, *Galatians, Essay on St. Paul and the Three*, p. 297.

preacher and martyr of liberty, and Philip the practical worker." *

The work of Philip resulted in further development. The apparently independent and unauthorized preaching amongst the Samaritans led to the Apostolic mission to Samaria (Acts viii. 4, 14), and the establishment of the Church throughout that district (viii. 25; ix. 31). His reception of the Ethiopian eunuch was a still bolder assault upon Jewish exclusiveness; for the Samaritans had some claim to be regarded as descendants of Abraham, but the Ethiopian eunuch belonged to the "accursed race of Ham."

A yet more decisive factor in the preparation for St. Paul's work was the mission of St. Peter to Cornelius, to which reference has been already made. The experience taught St. Peter that God was no respecter of persons (Acts x. 34); and it enabled him to see in a new light not merely the meaning of Jesus' last commission, but also the teaching of the

* See Lightfoot, *loc. cit.*

Prophets (Acts x. 42, 43). The outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon that Gentile company led to the first admission by an apostle to Church membership of uncircumcised Gentiles. The facts were such that refusal of baptism would have involved the withstanding of God (Acts xi. 17).

The result of St. Peter's experience on this occasion was far-reaching.* It silenced the opposition, and opened the eyes of the Apostles and many of the brethren in Judæa (Acts xi. 1, 18). And thus, before the arrival of St. Paul upon the scene of action, an important stage in the expansion of the Church had been reached. "The principle was broadly asserted that the Gospel received all comers, asking no questions, allowing no impediments, insisting on no preliminary conditions, if only it were found that the petitioner 'feared God and worked righteousness.'"†

* Cf. Acts xiv. 27; xv. 3, for a similar result of St. Paul's first missionary journey.

† Lightfoot, *Galatians, Essay on St. Paul and the Three*, p. 302.

But the assertion of the principle was not the same thing as its universal recognition, and it was left to St. Paul to "carry it out to its legitimate results," and to secure its acceptance by the Church.

The difficulties which he had to encounter manifested themselves as soon as the report of his first missionary journey had had time to circulate. To some the news of the conversion of Gentiles caused great joy (Acts xiv. 27; xv. 3), but amongst others it aroused vehement opposition (xv. 1, 2). The result was the Council of Jerusalem, by which the freedom of Gentile believers from the Jewish yoke was formally decreed, as being required both by the facts of experience and by the statements of Old Testament Prophets (xv. 15). But the battle was by no means over. St. Paul's steps were dogged throughout the remainder of his life by Judaizers who sought to disparage his authority and to undermine his influence.

Considering the tremendous issues which

were involved in such a departure from the tradition of centuries, and the opposition which St. Paul had to meet from those within the Church as well as from unbelieving Jews, it is not surprising that he constantly refers to the Divine origin of his apostleship and message. He claims that neither his apostleship nor his gospel proceeded from man (Gal. i. 1, 11 f., 16 f.), that he owed his knowledge to direct revelation (Eph. iii. 3), and his apostleship to the commandment of God (1 Tim. i. 1).

St. Paul further emphasizes the Divine character of his mission by his constant application of the word "mystery" to the revelation with which he had been entrusted.

In St. Paul's writings *μυστήριον** signifies

* *μυστήριον* is derived from *μύειν*, which means "to close the mouth," and so "to initiate" (*cf.* Phil. iv. 12, *μεμύημαι*, *i.e.*, "I have been initiated into the secret," and so, "I have learned"). Hence the substantive was used of secret rites and ceremonies, and came to denote something which was known only to a narrow circle; and that by initiation, and not by

something which was once unknown but has now been revealed. He applies the word to the relation of Christ to the Church, the restoration of the Jews, the change to be wrought at the resurrection, the truths of the Gospel generally, and, most frequently, to the "free admission of the Gentiles on equal terms to the privileges of the Covenant." Thus the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles was *the mystery which had been kept in silence through times eternal*

personal action inquiry, or study. And it was therefore associated with the idea of secrecy or reserve. It emphasized the privileged position of the few and the exclusion of the many.

In St. Paul's use of the word the emphasis was changed from that of secrecy to that of revelation. The Christian mysteries are not for a limited circle but for all men. They are truths which were once secret and unknown, but are now revealed and known. Hence the apparent paradox in the idea of *μυστήριον φανερόν*.

The word, as used by St. Paul, signifies nothing about the nature of the truth: the understanding of it may be easy and simple, or it may be difficult and "mysterious," in the modern sense of the word; but it is a "mystery" if it is a truth which could not have been known without revelation.

The word is in almost all instances used in connection with some word denoting revelation or knowledge; cf. Rom. xvi. 25 f.; 1 Cor. ii. 7; xiv. 2; xv. 51; Eph. i. 9; iii. 3, 5, 10; vi. 19; Col. i. 26; iv. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 7; 1 Tim. iii. 16; iv. 3.

See Lightfoot, *Colossians*, Note on chap. i. 26.

but now is manifested (Rom. xvi. 25 f.): it was the mystery of Christ which in other generations was not made known unto the sons of men as it hath now been revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit (Eph. iii. 4 f.). A dispensation of God was given to St. Paul to fulfil the word of God, even the mystery which hath been hid from all ages and generations, but now hath it been manifested to His saints, to whom God was pleased to make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory (Col. i. 26 f.). The preaching to the Gentiles was part of the mystery of godliness (i.e., the revelation which has to do with godli-*

* Various meanings have been assigned to the phrase πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον. According to some, it means "to make the word abound" (cf. Bengel, *perducere ad omnes*). Others regard it as referring to the nature of the preaching, and translate it "to preach fully," i.e., "to give its complete development to" (cf. Lightfoot, *ad loc.*). Others again regard τὸν λόγον as referring to Old Testament prophecy, and translate, "to fulfil the word." Each of these meanings of the phrase can be justified from New Testament usage of the words; but in the light of Rom. xv. 19 ("πεπληρωκέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον"), where the context requires the idea of causing the Gospel to abound, the first meaning seems to be preferable (cf. Luke vii. 1; Acts xii. 25; xiv. 26).

ness; cf. "the mystery of lawlessness," 2 Thess. ii. 7): *He who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, received up in glory* (1 Tim. iii. 16).

St. Paul's use of the word "mystery" in this connection is, as we have seen, to be explained by the fact that the truth had not been generally known under the Old Dispensation. But, while stating that fact, he also alludes to indications of the foreordained plan which are to be found in the Old Testament Scriptures: e.g., in Rom. xvi. 26 he speaks of the "mystery" as being made known unto all the nations *by the Scriptures of the Prophets, according to the commandment of the eternal God*; and in Gal. iii. 8 he says: *The Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the Gospel beforehand unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all the nations be blessed*; again, in Rom. ix. 23 ff. he quotes a passage from Hosea to illustrate God's calling of Gentiles as well as Jews.

Thus St. Paul brings himself into line with the teaching of our Lord recorded in Luke xxiv. 46 f., and we find here one of the many points of contact between St. Paul's writings and the third Gospel. In both, the evangelization of the world and the incorporation of the Gentiles in the mystical Body of Christ are set forth as the eternal purpose of God declared by the Old Testament Prophets, and destined to be fulfilled in the present dispensation.

In addition to general declarations of the ingathering of the Gentiles, St. Paul, in Rom. ix.-xi., presents the truth in its relation to the moral government of the world. Starting from the fact that for the purposes of grace God made choice of a portion of the race, St. Paul shows that from the beginning that choice was determined by the will of God, and not by fleshly descent: *They are not all Israel who are of Israel, neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children, but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is,*

it is not the children of the flesh that are children of God, but the children of the promise are reckoned for a seed (ix. 6-8). And this sovereign action of God was revealed in Old Testament prophecy as destined to operate amongst Gentiles as well as Jews (ix. 23-29), the evidence of such operation being faith, and its purpose righteousness (ix. 30 f.). The failure of the Jews as a nation to believe in Jesus did not make God's promises to them of none effect (ii. 2); there was a remnant according to the election of grace, and that remnant was a pledge of a future national conversion. But in the meantime the failure of the many had resulted in the *riches of the Gentiles*, and that again was the pledge of still greater riches through the subsequent conversion of the Jews (xi. 11-15, 25 f.).

St. Paul's conception, then, of the moral government of the world involves the idea that the present dispensation has witnessed the temporary casting away of Israel, with a view to the coming in of the *fulness of the Gentiles*; and

that, when that has been accomplished, the Jews as a people will throw off their blindness (xi. 25), and be received again into the visible favour of God. This *receiving of Israel* will be for the world as *life from the dead* (xi. 15).

This treatment of the subject links itself on to that wider conception which finds its fullest expression in the Epistles of the first captivity. St. Paul foresees the time when there shall be manifested the entire harmony of the universe, "which shall no longer contain alien and discordant elements, but of which all the parts shall find their centre and union in Christ.* To St. Paul, as to the Apostles generally, "the Gospel belongs to the end of the ages; it is the closing scene of the world's history," and "the Incarnation is the beginning of the end." The ultimate goal is the gathering up in one of all things in Christ. To this end Christ is the peace between Jew and Gentile (Eph. ii. 14), as well as the peace between God and

* Lightfoot, *Notes on Epp. of St. Paul*, p. 322. See also his note on Col. i. 20, and Gore, *Ep. to Eph.*, Note F.

man (Col. i. 20). To this end the Gospel of Christ is preached among all creation under heaven (Col. i. 23, *cf.* Phil. ii. 9-11). To this end, too, the Church, as ideally regarded, is *the fulness of Him that filleth all in all* (Eph. i. 23), an ideal towards the attainment of which "the actual militant Church must be ever advancing."*

It is not difficult to see that this supreme conception of Christ's person and work was the natural goal of the impressions produced upon St. Paul's mind by the vision which changed the course of his life.

The person who had won his heart was not Jesus as He lived and worked amongst men in the days of His humiliation, but the Glorified Christ; and his conception of the religion of Jesus was based on that vision.† The absence of reference in his epistles to the earthly life of Jesus must be regarded as

* See Lightfoot, *Colossians*, *Note on the meaning of πλήρωμα*, p. 255.

† *Cf.* Ewald, *History of Israel*, vii., pp. 290 ff.

deliberate, and not as accidental. Jesus in the flesh offered no point of contact with St. Paul's own experience; as such he knew Him no more (see 2 Cor. v. 16). Jesus was to St. Paul the Christ, glorified with the glory which had been His before the Incarnation, and was His by right (*cf.* 2 Cor. viii. 9; Phil. ii. 6). St. Paul, unlike the older Apostles, had nothing to unlearn about Jesus in the course of his discipleship; he was able to see Christ, from the first moment of his surrender to Him, in His relation to the history of the world. From the first, Christ was to him, not merely another teacher, but the goal towards which all previous revelation had been working. The call of Abraham, the separation of Israel, the dispensation of the Law, were but steps in the preparation of the world for the manifestation of God's Son in the nature of man. And with the appearance of the second Adam all distinctions faded away. Henceforth the way of salvation was the same for all, and was to be within the reach of all. Hence-

forth *there can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female: for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus* (Gal. iii. 28).

The vision of Christ in His celestial glory prepared the Apostle for an immediate obedience to the revelation *that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs and fellow-members of the body, and fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the Gospel* (Eph. iii. 6).

The reasonableness—we might almost say the necessity—of the explanation given in Acts and Galatians, of the radical change of life and thought which such a conception involved for this “Hebrew of Hebrews,” can only be fully appreciated by calling to mind the marked contrast between his subsequent attitude towards the Gentiles and that of contemporary Judaism. It is not that he makes light of the failure of the Gentiles; on the contrary, he asserts that their very condition is a manifestation of the moral government of God, and he declares them to be *without*

excuse (see Rom. i. 18 ff.). But the divergence is exhibited in his teaching about the nature of their failure, and the situation to which it gave rise.

The Judaistic condemnation of the Gentiles was grounded upon their ignorance of the Law. *This multitude which knoweth not the Law are accursed* was not, it is true, spoken with reference to the Gentiles, yet it was an utterance which may be fairly regarded as representing the Judaistic conception of the standard of judgment.

But with St. Paul the condemnation of the Gentiles turned on their refusal of the knowledge of God as He had been revealed to them in nature (Rom. i. 21), and on their failure to fulfil the law of conscience (*ibid.* ii. 14 f.). In respect of salvation he allowed no difference between Jew and Gentile: both had a pathway of obedience to follow, both had failed to render obedience, both stood in the same need.* And whereas, according to the current

* See Rom. i. 16; ii. 9; iii. 9, 23; 1 Cor. i. 24; xii. 13;

conception, Gentiles who had not been admitted to the privileges of Judaism were doomed to destruction, to St. Paul they were the object of Divine mercy ; their condition proved their need of the Gospel, and constituted him their debtor (see Rom. i. 14 ff. ; 1 Cor. ix. 16 ff.).

It was this sense of obligation to the Gentile world, combined with the constraining power of the love of Christ, which gave direction to the zeal and activity of St. Paul. The commission given by Jesus to the Church had been foreshadowed by Prophet and Psalmist ; its fulfilment had been started on its course by St. Peter ; its final issue was seen, in anticipation, by St. John (see Apoc. ix. 7 ff.) ; but it was left to St. Paul to make the Church realize her vocation, and to guide her along the pathway of obedience.

Gal. iii. 28 ; Col. iii. 11. Cf. Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 434.

CONCLUSION

THE EVIDENTIAL VALUE OF THE CATHOLICITY OF THE CHURCH

The ingathering of the nations only one feature of the prophetic picture of the latter days.

The Messiah.

Spiritual religion.

The three features realized in Christianity.

The correspondence of prophecy and fact.

The prophecy did not produce the phenomena.

The teaching of Christ a direct revelation.

The argument from prophecy.

Principle to be distinguished from method and application.

Illustration from Justin Martyr.

Its bearing on the belief in the inspiration of the Old Testament.

CHAPTER X

THE EVIDENTIAL VALUE OF THE CATHOLICITY OF THE CHURCH

THE examination of the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, which we have pursued in the previous pages, has served to emphasize the fact that the catholicity of the Christian Church had been anticipated in the teaching of Psalmist and Prophet. That such should have been the case was to be expected. The experience of the past discloses the fact that the crises in the providential ordering of the world's history have not happened without due preparation and warning. *The Lord GOD will do nothing, but He revealeth His secret unto His servants the Prophets* (Amos iii. 7) is a statement

whose application is not limited to the work of the Old Testament Prophets or to the history of the Old Testament Church. And, consistently with this principle of the Divine government of the world, the distinguishing feature of the New Dispensation, which we have been considering, was prepared for by the constantly repeated utterances of the Prophets.

That stream of prophecy, however, must not be separated from its environment. The ingathering of the nations of the world through the instrumentality of Israel was only one feature of the prophetic picture of the latter days.

In the centre of the picture is a person, portrayed from various aspects and under varying circumstances. Now he is the king of the line of David to whom the promised kingdom belongs ; now he is a sufferer, afflicted for the sake of his people. At one time he is resplendent with majesty and glory, at another he is meek, lowly, and having *no beauty that we should desire him*. In some passages

he is Jehovah Himself, in others he is the servant of Jehovah.

Little did the Jews realize that these were not parallel but converging lines, destined to meet in one person; but we, as we look back from the fulfilment to the prophecy, can see that they were varying aspects of the coming Redeemer, each of which has its perfect fulfilment in Jesus Christ, either as He was manifested in the flesh or as He is portrayed in His future glory in the pages of the New Testament.

To these two prominent features in the Old Testament picture of the latter days there must be added yet a third.

In Old Testament prophecy there is frequent reference to the establishment of a more spiritual form of the worship of Jehovah. The protests of the Prophets and Psalmists, from Samuel onwards,* against the religious formalism of their times was accompanied by definite prediction of a change in the manner

* *Cf.* 1 Sam. xv. 22; Psa. xl. 6; l. 8; li. 16; Isa. i. 11; lxvi. 3; Hos. vi. 6; Mic. vi. 8.

of man's approach to God and of God's relation to man. The tables of stone were to give way to the law written in the heart (see Jer. xxxi. 33; Ezek. xi. 19 f.; xxxvi. 26 f.; cf. 2 Cor. iii. 3); the offering of animal sacrifices was to give way to the offering of a free will (Psa. xl. 6-8); the covenant of works was to be replaced by the covenant of grace (Jer. xxxi. 31 ff.; xxxii. 40; cf. Heb. viii. 8 ff., x. 16 f.); the system of repeated, and therefore ineffectual, sacrifices was to be superseded by a system in which there would be no more remembrance of sin and iniquities (Jer. xxxi. 34; cf. Heb. viii. 8 ff., x. 16 f.); the distinctions of ceremonial holiness and uncleanness were to be abolished; in the latter days *Holy unto the Lord* should be written upon the bells of the horses, and every pot in Jerusalem and Judah should be *holy unto the Lord of hosts* (Zech. xiv. 20, 21).

Thus the prophetic anticipation of the future embraced these three marked features. The central thought was that of the advent of a personal deliverer, and in connection with that

were the two conceptions, of a kingdom which would include all the nations, and of a religion whose essence would consist in the exercise of the heart rather than in the observance of ceremony.

Passing in thought over the centuries which have elapsed since the close of the Old Testament Canon, we look at the phenomena in the religious life of our own time. We find that the worship of the God of the Jews has undergone certain radical changes. The national exclusiveness of the people of Jehovah has been abolished, and the right of equal access of all men to Him has been recognised and established in its stead. Men of all races and climes and tongues enjoy the same religious privileges. The sacred books of the Jews are jealously guarded as the records of Divine revelation by millions for whom Circumcision, the Passover, and the Ceremonial Law are things of the past, elements of a superseded system.

A Jewish community still remains, but it

is insignificant in numbers and powerless to propagate its creed ; but it remains a standing witness to the source from which the great and increasing force of Christendom first sprang.

Together with this transformation of the "Commonwealth of Israel" into the Catholic Church, we notice a second equally radical and vital change. The religion of the Catholic Church is essentially spiritual. The keynote of the former dispensation was the separation of man from God, and the impossibility of access save through a system of ritual observance, external sacrifices, and vicarious priesthood. Under the present dispensation the same Lord is worshipped, but the essential feature of the religion is the enjoyment of union with the Divine nature through the indwelling of the Spirit of God. Belief in the transcendence of God has not been abandoned, but there has been added to it the complementary truth of the Divine immanence. The heart of the renewed man is God's throne, his body is God's temple.

In the third place, this Catholic Church is the Church of Christ, and this spiritual religion is the Christian religion. In other words, these two fundamental transformations of the Church and religion of the Old Dispensation were the direct results of the teaching of Jesus who claimed to be the Christ. To Him are traced the establishment of the Catholic Church, and the emancipation of the worship of Jehovah from the bondage of Judaism. His Death is accepted as the ratification of the New Covenant. His Resurrection is the citadel of the new Faith. His glorified Person is the source of the new life. He is at once the Founder, the Life, the Message, and the Hope of Christendom. The Christian Faith is so bound up with the claims of its Founder, that to eliminate belief in Him as *the way, the truth, and the life*, would be to attribute the greatest moral and spiritual force that the world has known to blasphemous fable and monstrous deceit. The Christian religion may be distinguished from other religions in many

respects, but not least in this, that, whereas in other religions the actual or reputed founders are now mere names of history, or memories to be cultivated, the very truth of the Christian religion is bound up with the belief, not merely in the work of its Founder upon earth, but also in His eternal existence and His mediatorial work in glory.

In other words, the phenomenon presented by the history and character of Christianity is, from this point of view, threefold.

It is the religion which takes its start from, and finds its continual hope and strength in Him who was *born in Bethlehem of Judæa, a Saviour which is Christ the Lord.*

It is the religion which is world-wide in its embrace, the various branches of the Christian Church covering the earth with an ever-increasing network of missions.

It is the religion which inculcates the necessity of spiritual worship based on the spiritual union between God and the worshipper.

The correspondence of these three phenomena to the predictions of the Old Testament Prophets is unmistakable. So long as the prophecy remained unconfirmed by facts, it depended for its acceptance upon its own intrinsic value; but for us experience is added to the witness of the writings themselves, and we believe in their Divine inspiration because of what we see in the world around us.

It might be argued that the prophecy produced the phenomena, and that therefore to claim the latter as a proof of the truth of the former is to be a victim of "the vicious circle." And the argument would have some force if the Jewish nation, who were the guardians of the prophecies, had interpreted the predictions along lines which corresponded to the subsequent phenomena. But the facts are otherwise. The Jewish nation rejected Jesus, and refused to recognise in His life and teaching the fulfilment of the oracles which had been committed to their keeping. The phenomena presented in Christianity have been produced

in spite of the Jewish nation, who remain unbelievers to the present day.

It is, of course, true that the first Christians were Jews, but their acceptance of Christianity was not the natural product of their study of the Old Testament Scriptures; on the contrary, the interpretation of Scripture which they came to accept was determined by their belief in Jesus as the Christ.

In other words, the contribution of the Apostles to the transformation which has been effected in the worship of Jehovah must be traced primarily, not to their possession of the prophetic writings, but to their acceptance of the teaching of Jesus.

But might it not be argued that the teaching of Jesus was itself the fruit of the study of the Old Testament, that He was simply an enlightened Jew, and that therefore the results of His teaching cannot be adduced as independent testimony to the truth of Old Testament prophecy?

That Jesus had a thorough knowledge of the

Old Testament Scriptures is obvious; but the argument does not take sufficient account of other facts. Jesus did not win His reputation as the discoverer of a new interpretation of Old Testament prophecy. He presented Himself to men as the Mediator of a new revelation, which had been prepared for by the teaching of the Prophets, but was nevertheless new. Where Old Testament teaching had anticipated His own teaching, He did not hesitate to claim its support; and yet the source of His message was not the Scriptures, but God. The following utterances will suffice to illustrate the point: *I speak the things which I have seen with My Father* (John viii. 38); *I spake not from Myself; but the Father which sent Me, He hath given Me a commandment, what I should say and what I should speak . . . the things which I speak, even as the Father hath said unto Me, so I speak* (John xii. 49 f.); *Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me? The words that I say unto you, I speak not from Myself; but*

the Father abiding in Me doeth His works" (John xiv. 10).

We cannot, therefore, regard the teaching of Jesus as merely the product of the teaching of the Prophets, nor the reconstruction of the worship of Jehovah as the fruit of Judaism. But we can see in that reconstruction a correspondence to the predictions of the Prophets, which bears witness to the inspired character of their teaching, and to the unity of the Divine purpose throughout the ages of the history of man.

It is frequently assumed that the argument from prophecy has lost its validity with the advance of the critical study of Scripture; and it must be frankly admitted that much of the argument as propounded in early Christian writings must be abandoned. But it is the method and application of the argument, rather than the principle, which modern scholarship has rejected. The interpretation which was put upon specific texts may be questioned, but the main drift of Messianic

prophecy, the general portraiture of the time which was to be, remains unimpaired.*

The First Apology of Justin may be cited in illustration both of the permanent and transitory elements in the argument from prophecy.

The general position as laid down by Justin is as valid to-day as it was then, viz., that the life of Jesus on earth was the fulfilment of prophecy, and that the fulfilment of prophecy which has been already accomplished is justification for confident expectation that the things predicted, which are still to come to pass, shall likewise be fulfilled.† But the particular use which Justin makes of specific proof texts has in many instances no value for us, except as illustration of the exegesis which was employed in an uncritical age. A case in point is his explanation of the words of Isaiah, *the government shall be upon His shoulders*, which Justin regards as

* See Stanton, *The Jewish Messiah*, pp. 176 ff.

† See Justin, *Apol. I.*, cc. 30, 52.

“significant of the power of the Cross, for to it, when He was crucified, He applied His shoulders.”* Such an application of the argument from prophecy is no longer possible, because the critical method of exegesis has been discovered, and we have learned to distinguish between the form and the substance of prediction. The purely formal elements of prediction were coloured by the transitory conceptions of the individual prophet; the fulfilment is limited to the essential, ideal elements. True prediction clothes itself with a local, temporal, and circumstantial dress. Future events cannot be presented in prediction in the circumstances of the future and from the point of view of the future. That would be to ascribe to prediction the characteristics of history.†

But this change in method and application does not involve the abandonment of the argument from prophecy. We claim, in the

* See Justin, *Apol. I.*, c. 35.

† See Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 43.

words of Professor Briggs, that "we have in the Messianic prophecy of the Old Testament an organic system constantly advancing on the original lines, and expanding into new and more comprehensive phases with the progress of the centuries, an organism so complex that the wisest sages of Israel could not comprehend it." *

And yet in the variety and complexity exhibited in the intermingling of the human and the Divine, of suffering and glory, of grace and judgment, there is a unity which could only be comprehended after the glorification of the Incarnate Son of God. "The Messiah of prophecy and the Messiah of history, the redemption of Hebrew prediction and the redemption of Christian possession, are not diverse but entirely harmonious in the Lamb, who was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times of its history. None but God could give such prophecy; none but God could fulfil

* *Ibid.*, pp. 497 ff.

such prophecy. The ideal of prophecy and the real of history correspond in Him who is above the limits of time and space and circumstance, who is the Creator, Ruler, and Saviour of the world, and who alone has the wisdom, the grace, and the power to conceive the idea of redemption, and then accomplish it in reality, through the Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension, and Second Advent of His only begotten and well-beloved Son, very God of very God, the Light, and Life, and Saviour of the world."

Our own day is one of unsettlement in respect of many things, and not least in the attitude of men towards the Old Testament Scriptures. Traditional views of the history and authorship of the documents have been rudely shaken, long-established ideas as to the nature of inspiration have been abandoned, methods of exegesis which satisfied our fathers have been set on one side, and in the midst of this general upheaval of thought it is not surprising that belief in the Old Testament

Scriptures as containing the Word of God has been sorely tried.

It is well, then, that we should give the more careful consideration to the predictions which those Scriptures record. And when we find in them a forecast of future events to which experience offers no parallel, a forecast moreover which exactly corresponds to facts as they present themselves to view in our own day, we can face with equanimity the problems which the progress of Biblical criticism has brought into prominence ; knowing that, whatever modifications we may have to accept in our views of the human element in Holy Scripture, our belief in the Divine element will remain unshaken ; it will ever be to us that which *was spoken by the Lord through the Prophet.*

INDICES

INDICES

I.

INDEX OF REFERENCES TO PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE.

GENESIS—	PAGE	GENESIS (<i>continued</i>)—	PAGE
i. 26 f. ...	11	xxviii. 14 ...	27, 29
iii. 15 ...	19	xxxv. 11 ...	11
iii. 22 ...	11	xlii. 37 ...	46
vi. 3 ...	10	xlix. 10 ...	30, 86
vi. 9 ...	62		
vi. 13 ...	10, 62	LEVITICUS—	
vii. 15 ...	62	xvii. 14 ...	62
ix. 25 f. ...	21	xxv. 10 ...	77
xi. 7 ...	11		
xii. 1 ff. ...	27	NUMBERS—	
xii. 7 ...	28	xvi. 22 ...	62
xiii. 14 ff. ...	28	xxiv. 17 ff. ...	47
xv. 5 ...	28	xxvii. 16... ..	62
xv. 13 ...	10	xxxvi. 7 ...	77
xvi. 10 ff. ...	11		
xvii. 4 ff. ...	26	DEUTERONOMY—	
xvii. 6 ...	11	v. 26 ...	62
xvii. 16 ...	11	xxiii. 3 ...	77
xvii. 19 ff. ...	26		
xviii. 17 ...	28	JOSHUA—	
xviii. 18 ...	27	xxiii. 2 ...	54
xxii. 15 ff. ...	28	xxiv. 1 ...	54
xxii. 18 ...	27	xxiv. 31 ...	54
xxvi. 4 ...	27, 29		

JUDGES—				PAGE	PSALMS (<i>continued</i>)—				PAGE
ii. 10	54	xlix.	111
v. 6 ff.	54	l. 8	217
viii. 23	55	li. 16	217
ix. 6	55	lix.	106
1 SAMUEL—					lxv. 2	62, 107
viii. 1 ff.	54	lxv. 5	107
viii. 7	53	lxvi. 4 ff.	107
xii. 12	53	lxvii. 2 ff.	108
xv. 22	217	lxviii. 28 ff.	108
2 SAMUEL—					lxxiii.	111
vii. 13 ff.	55	lxxviii. 67 f.	32
2 CHRONICLES—					lxxxiii.	106
ii. 16	86	lxxxvi. 9	108
iii. 6	86	lxxxvii.	12
ix. 1 ff.	86	lxxxvii. 5 f.	108
xxxiii. 23	86	lxxxix. 4, 29, 35 f.	55
EZRA—					xciv. 10	108
iii. 12	84	xevi.—xcix.	108
JOB—					c.	109
xxxiv. 15	62	cii. 13 ff.	109
PSALMS—					cix.	112
ii. 8	105	cxvii.	109
ii. 17	105	cxxxvi. 25	62
viii.	156	cxlv. 21	62
xxii. 27 ff.	106	cl.	109
xxxiii.	106	ISAIAH—				
xxxvii.	111	i. 11	217
xl. 6	217 f.	ii. 2 ff.	64, 66, 109
xlvi.	106	xi. 1	66
xlvi.	106	xi. 9	67
xlvi.	106	xi. 10	66
xlvi. 9	106 f.	xviii. 7	67
					xix. 23 ff.	68
					xl. 5 f.	62
					xl. 18 ff.	82
					xli. 8	77 f.

ISAIAH (*continued*)—

	PAGE
xli. 21 ff. ...	82
xlii. 1 ff. ...	80
xlii. 8 ...	3, 82
xliv. 3 ff. ...	63
xliv. 8 ff. ...	82
xlvi. 5 ff. ...	82
xlix. 3 ...	77 f.
xlix. 6, 11 ff. ...	80
xlix. 20 ff. ...	81
xlix. 26 ...	62
liv. 3 ...	81
lv. 3 ...	55
lv. 5 ...	80
lvi. 3 ff. ...	81
lvi. 7 ...	140
lx. 1 ff. ...	81
lxvi. 3 ...	217
lxvi. 16 ff. ...	62
lxvi. 19, 23 ...	81

JEREMIAH—

i. 10 ...	73
iii. 17 f. ...	74
iv. 1 f. ...	74
xii. 14 ff. ...	74
xvi. 13 ff. ...	11
xvi. 19 ...	75
xxv. 31 ...	62
xxxi. 33 f. ...	218
xxxii. 27... ...	62
xxxii. 40 ...	218
xxxiii. 9 ...	75
xlvi. 5 ...	62

EZEKIEL—

xi. 19 f. ...	218
---------------	-----

EZEKIEL (*continued*)—

	PAGE
xvii. 23 f. ...	75
xx. 48 ...	62
xxi. 45 ...	62
xxxvi. 26 f. ...	218
xxxvii. 28 ...	76
xxxviii. 23 ...	76
xxxix. 7, 23 ...	76
xlvi. 22 f. ...	77

DANIEL—

ii. 36 ff. ...	94
vii. 13 ff. ...	96 ff.

HOSEA—

i. 10 ...	56 f.
ii. 23 ...	56 f.
vi. 6 ...	217
xiii. 11 ...	55

JOEL—

ii. 28 f. ...	61
---------------	----

AMOS—

ii. 9 ff. ...	58
iii. 6 ff. ...	5
iii. 7 ...	10, 215
iv. 11 ...	58
ix. 11 f. ...	59

OBADIAH—

21 ...	57
--------	----

JONAH ...

...	60
-----	----

MICAH—

iv. 1 ff. ...	64, 109
---------------	---------

MICAH (*continued*)—

	PAGE
iv. 13	65
v. 2 ff., 7 f.	65
vi. 8	217

ZEPHANIAH—

ii. 11	69, 92
ii. 13	62
iii. 9, 14 ff.	68

HAGGAI—

i. 5 ff.	84
ii. 3	84
ii. 6 ff.	85
ii. 9	87

ZECHARIAH—

ii. 11	88
viii. 13, 20 ff.	88
ix. 9 f.	85, 89
xiv. 9, 16	89
xiv. 20 f.	90, 92, 218

MALACHI—

i. 11	90
iii. 1	85 f.

ST. MATTHEW—

ii. 1 ff.	173
iv. 23	146
v.	142, 162
v. 17	8
viii. 4	130
viii. 10 f.	140
ix. 30	130
x. 5 f.	136
x. 7	132
x. 17 ff.	133

ST. MATTHEW (*continued*)

	PAGE
x. 32	132
xii. 16	130
xv. 24	137
xvi. 13	150
xvi. 20	130
xvii. 9	131
xviii. 18	183
xxi. 43	140
xxii. 23	112
xxiii. 15	125
xxiv. 14	141
xxvi. 13	141
xxvi. 32	165
xxvi. 67	164
xxviii. 7	165
xxviii. 10	165
xxviii. 16	164
xxviii. 18 ff.	171, 180

ST. MARK—

i. 37	146
i. 44	130
i. 45	135
iii. 12	130
v. 19 f.	136
v. 43	130
vi. 12	132
vii. 31 ff.	136
viii. 27	150
viii. 30	130
ix. 9	131
xi. 17	140
xiii.	133
xiii. 10	141
xiv. 9	141
xvi. 9 ff.	166

ST. LUKE—

	PAGE
i. 68 ff. ...	125
ii. 10 ff. ...	173
ii. 25 ff. ...	125
iv. 25 ...	139
iv. 43 ...	146
v. 14 ...	130
v. 15 ...	135
vi. ...	162
vii. 1 ...	202
viii. 1 ...	146
ix. 18 ...	150
ix. 21 ...	130
ix. 36 ...	131
x. 1 ...	133
x. 9 ...	132 f.
xiii. 22 ...	146
xiii. 28 ff. ...	140
xiv. ...	162
xvi. ...	162
xxi. ...	133
xxii. 37 ...	79
xxii. 53 ...	135
xxiv. 15 ff. ...	167
xxiv. 33 ...	165, 182
xxiv. 44 ...	13, 17
xxiv. 45 ff. ...	174, 204

ST. JOHN—

i. 3 ff. ...	178
i. 9 ...	7
i. 12 ...	178
i. 17 ...	6
ii. 13 ff. ...	144
iii. 16 f. ...	143, 178
iii. 19 ...	177
iii. 22 ...	145
iv. 1 ff. ...	135, 145

ST. JOHN (*continued*)

	PAGE
iv. 23 ...	7, 69, 93
iv. 39 ff. ...	145
v. 27 ...	20
vi. 14 f. ...	134
vi. 32 ...	7
vi. 51 ...	143
vii. 1 ...	135
vii. 6 ff. ...	135
vii. 30 ...	135
vii. 35 ...	12
vii. 44 ...	135
viii. 12 ...	143
viii. 20 ...	135
viii. 26 ...	13
viii. 38 ...	225
x. 16 ...	140
xi. 50 ...	48
xi. 54 ...	135
xii. 18 f. ...	152
xii. 27 ...	135
xii. 34 ...	151
xii. 37 ...	152
xii. 46 ...	143
xii. 49 f. ...	225
xiv. 10 ...	226
xv. 1 ...	7
xvi. 8 ...	178
xvii. 1 f. ...	135, 143
xx. 19 ff. ...	168, 177 ff., 182 ff.
xx. 26 ...	165
xx. 30 f. ...	170

ACTS—

i. 2 f. ...	161
i. 8 f. ...	144, 174, 179 ff.
i. 12 ...	168
ii. 39 ...	191

ACTS (*continued*)—

	PAGE
iii. 25	28, 192
vi. 1	195
vii. 56	154
viii. 1 ff.	194
viii. 4	194, 197
viii. 14	197
viii. 25	197
ix. 15	189
ix. 29	195
ix. 31	197
x. 28	12, 192
x. 34	197
x. 40 f.	161
x. 43	176, 198
xi. 1	198
xi. 3	12
xi. 17 f.	198
xi. 19 f.	194
xii. 25	202
xiv. 26 f.	198 f., 202
xv. 1 ff.	198 f.
xv. 7 ff.	193
xv. 15 f.	59, 199
xxii. 15	189
xxii. 21	189
xxiii. 8	112
xxvi. 16 ff.	190

ROMANS—

i. 14 ff.	210 f.
i. 18 ff.	210
i. 21	210
ii. 2	205
ii. 9	210
ii. 14 f.	210
iii. 2	26
iii. 9	210

ROMANS (*continued*)—

	PAGE
iii. 23	210
ix. 6 ff.	205
ix. 15 ff.	57, 205
ix. 23 ff.	203
ix. 25 f.	56, 205 f.
ix. 30 ff.	57, 205
x. 4	5
x. 6 ff.	57
xi. 11 ff.	205
xi. 15	206
xi. 25 f.	205 f.
xv. 12	66
xv. 19	202
xvi. 25 f.	13, 201 f., 203

1 CORINTHIANS—

i. 24	210
ii. 7	201
ix. 16 ff.	211
xii.	181
xii. 13	210
xiii. 9	9
xiv. 2	201
xv. 5 ff.	161, 165
xv. 28	156
xv. 51	201

2 CORINTHIANS—

ii. 16	177, 185
iii. 3	218
v. 16	208
viii. 9	208

GALATIANS—

i. 1	200
i. 6	8

GALATIANS (<i>continued</i>)—				2 THESSALONIANS—			
			PAGE				PAGE
i. 11 f.	200	ii. 7	201, 203
i. 16 f.	200				
ii. 9	192	1 TIMOTHY—			
ii. 11	191	i. 1	200
iii. 8	28, 203	i. 5	5
iii. 10 ff.	5	iii. 16	201, 203
iii. 23	5	iv. 3	201
iii. 28	209, 211				
EPHESIANS—				HEBREWS—			
i. 9	201	i. 1	4
i. 23	207	ii. 6	156
ii. 14	13, 87, 206	viii. 5	6
iii. 3 ff.	13, 200 ff.	viii. 8 ff.	218
iii. 6	209	ix. 23	6
iii. 10	201	x. 1	6
iv. 12	181	x. 16 f.	218
vi. 19	201				
PHILIPPIANS—				1 ST. PETER—			
ii. 6	208	i. 11	78
ii. 9 ff.	207				
iv. 12	200	2 ST. PETER—			
COLOSSIANS—				i. 21	78
i. 20	207				
i. 26 f.	201 f.	1 ST. JOHN—			
ii. 14	5	ii. 20	8
ii. 17	5	ii. 27	8
iii. 11	211	iii. 2	8
iv. 3	201	v. 20	8
				REVELATION—			
				i. 13	154
				ix. 7 ff.	211
				xiv. 14	154

II

INDEX OF AUTHORS AND SUBJECTS.

- Abraham, 26 ff., 33, 46, 106, 116, 208
 accommodation, Divine, 47, 55, 135, 138
Acts, record of the Last Command in, 168, 179 ff.
ἀλήθεια, 7
Amos, 58
 "Angel of the Lord, the," 11
 Antioch, 191
 Apocalypses, Jewish, 115 ff.
Apocrypha, *the*, 115 ff.
 Aristion, Ariston, 166 f.
Assumption of Moses, *the*, 124
 Assyria, 67

 Balaam, the prophecy of, 47
 Bar-cochba, 48
 Barnabas, the epistle of, 6
 Baruch, the apocalypse of, 123
 Bengel, 202
 Briggs, 25, 27, 36, 228 ff.

 Cæsarea Philippi, 150 f.
 Caiaphas, the prophecy of, 48
 Cairns, 134
 Captivity, the Return from, 83
 Charles, R. H., 120, 122
 Christ, the teaching of, not an isolated revelation, 4, 12 f., 176, 208; and the Law, 8; and spiritual worship, 69, 92 f., 221; and the interpretation of Scripture, 79; attitude towards the Gentiles during the public ministry, 129 ff.; during the ministry of the Forty Days, 161 ff.; anticipations of the Last Command, 131, 139 ff.; expansive character of His ministry, 144 ff.; the teaching of the Forty Days, 161 ff.; the mediator of a new revelation, 225; the records of the Last Command, 161 ff.
 Christianity, features of, compared with Old Testament prediction, 219 ff.
 Church, the, catholicity of, 12, 191, 215 ff.
 Clement of Rome, 28
 Command, the Last (see Christ, Gospels, Luke)
 Communion, the Holy, 91
 Conybeare, 166
 Cornelius, conversion of, 176, 192, 197 f.
 Covenant at Sinai, the, 44

Creation, the, account of, 36
Cyprian, 48

Daniel, 94 ff., 117, 155

David, the promise to, 55, 59

Davidson, A. B., 12, 78, 81

Deacons, the, appointment of, 196

Delitzsch, 20, 27, 36

Denney, 100, 155, 157

"desirable things, the," 85 f.

development of doctrine, 9 f., 110 f.

De Wette, 27

Didache, the, 91

Dillmann, 27

Driver, 12, 27, 30, 32, 38, 100

Drummond, 100

Ἑβραῖοι, 195

Ecclesiasticus, 28; the Messianic hope in, 116

Edersheim, 118

Egypt, 67

Egyptian oppression, the, 43

Eli, 54

Ἑλλήνες, 194 f.

Ἑλλημιστές, 194 f.

Enoch, the Book of, 97, 99, 119

Esdras, the Fourth of, 124

Eucharist, the, 91

Eusebius of Cæsarea, 91

Evangelization, incentives to, 3, 180

Ewald, 27, 100, 118, 138, 191

exclusiveness, Jewish, 12, 23, 93, 124, 209 f.

exterminating wars, 45 ff.

Ezekiel, 75

Fall, the, story of, 18 f., 35

Farrar, 100

finality of the Christian revelation, 8 ff.

Forty Days, the, ministry of, 161 ff.
future life, 46, 111 f.

Galilean ministry, the, 139, 145 f.

Galilee, Christ's appearance in, after the Resurrection, 164

Genesis, predictions in, 11, 34 ff.; early chapters of, 38 f.

Gentiles, the, attitude of later Judaism towards, 121 f., 210

Gesenius, 27

Gore, 206

Goshen, the settlement of the Israelites in, 43

Gospels, the, comparison of the records of the Last Command in, 163 ff.; the guiding principle of each writer, 169 ff.

Gould, 100, 152

Gray, 48

Habakkuk, 56 f.

Haggai, 83 ff.

Hofmann, 25

Hort, 183, 191, 193

Hosea, 56 f.

idolatry, as the robbery of God, 3, 82; sinfulness impressed upon Israel, 45

Incarnation, the, purpose of, 133 f., 143, 156, 178, 206 f.

individuality, defective idea of, 46

inspiration, 12, 78, 100, 109 f.,
163, 230 f.

'Iovðaiot, 195

Irenæus, 25, 48, 91, 167

Isaac, 29, 33, 116

Isaiah, 66 ff., 77 ff.

Israel, the choice of, 18, 204 ff.

Jacob, 29, 33, 37

James, St. (see Jerusalem)

Japheth, 22 ff., 37

Jehovah, sovereignty of, 58, 75,
105 ff., 110, 205

Jeremiah, 73

Jerome, 24, 31, 85

Jerusalem, Council of, 59, 192 ff.,
199

Jews, the, exclusiveness of, 12,
23, 93, 124, 209 f.

Joel, 61

John, St., universalism of, 177 ff.
(see Christ, Gospels, Law,
Ministry)

Jonah, 60 f.

Joshua, 54

Jubilees, the Book of, 23, 121 f.

Judah, 29 ff., 33, 38

Judith, the Book of, 117

Justin Martyr, 25, 28, 31, 48, 91,
99, 227

Kingdom, the Messianic, 30 ff.,
95 ff., 118 f., 171

Kirkpatrick, 78, 80, 92, 103, 107,
114

Knobel, 27

"latter days, the," Prophetic
picture of, 121, 175, 216 ff.

Law, the, a preparatory revela-
tion, 4 ff., 208; attitude of
Christ and the Apostles towards;
5 ff.; attitude of later Judaism
towards, 119 ff., 210 f.

Liddon, 19

Lightfoot, 193, 196, 198, 201 f.

Luke, St., features of the Last
Command as given in, 167,
172 ff. (see Acts, Christ, Gospels)

Malachi, 90

Marcion, 6

Mark, St. (see Aristion, Christ,
Gospels)

Matthew, St. (see Christ, Gospels,
Kingdom)

Messiah, the, 20, 48, 55, 67, 85 f.,
97 f., 116 ff., 134, 152 f., 216 ff.

Micah, 64 ff.

Ministry, the Christian, 183 ff.

Monarchy, the Jewish, 10, 32, 35,
48, 53 ff.

Mosaic Period, the, 43 ff.

"mystery," St. Paul's use of the
word, 200 ff.

Nahum, 56 f.

New Testament, the, in what
sense a final revelation, 8 f.

Noah, the prophecy of, 21, 37

Obadiah, 56 f.

Onkelos, the Targum of, 23

Orelli, 12, 22

Origen, 31

- Papias, 166
 Patriarchs, the, 26 ff.
 Paul, St., his use of Old Testament, 56; conversion of, 189 f., 209; obedience of, 190 f., 209; claims of, 200 ff.; his conception of the moral government of the world, 204 ff.; his conception of Christ, 207 ff.; his conception of the failure of the Gentiles, 209 ff. (see Finality, Idolatry, Law, Mystery)
 Pentecost, the day of, 61, 191, 196
 Peter, St., 130, 192 (see Antioch, Cornelius, Jerusalem, Pentecost)
 Pharisees, the, 125
 Philip, 194, 197
 Philo, 24
πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον, 202
 prediction, a necessary element of revelation, 10, 39; the temporary and permanent elements, 91, 228
 prophecy, the argument from, 100, 109, 219 ff., 226 ff.
Protevangelium, the, 19, 36
 Psalms, the, their relation to the rest of the Old Testament, 103
 Pseudo-Jonathan, Targum of, 25
 Pusey, 91
 remitting and retaining of sins, the, 182 ff.
 Reuben, 46
 revelation, unity and progressive character of, 4 ff., 10, 208
 sacrificial language, early use of, in connection with the Lord's Supper (see Communion)
 Salmon, 166
 Sanday, 83, 100, 157 f.
 Schultz, 25, 27, 94 f., 100, 118
 Schürer, 94 f., 100, 116, 152
 Scripture (see Christ, Inspiration, Revelation)
 Septuagint, the, 23, 28, 31, 47, 59, 87, 107
 Sermon on the Mount, the, 142, 162
 "Servant" of the Lord, the, 77 ff.
 Seventy, the, mission of, 133
 Shem, the promise to, 22 ff., 29, 37
 "Shiloh," 30 ff.
 Sibylline oracles, the, 118 f.
 Simeon, 125
 Sinai, 44
 Sinker, 86
 Smith, G. Adam, 92
 solidarity, conception of, in Israel, 46
 Solomon, the Psalms of, 119 f.
 "Son of Man, the," 19 ff., 143 f., 149 ff.
 Spirit, the (see Acts, Joel, John)
 Stanton, 94, 96, 100, 116, 118, 151 f., 155, 227
 Stone, Darwell, 91
 Supper, the Lord's, 91, 162
 Swete, 166, 183 f.
 Talmud, 31, 99
 Targum (see Onkelos, Pseudo-Jonathan)

- | | |
|--|---|
| Teller, 31 | Vulgate, the, 23, 28, 31, 85 |
| Temple, the, 83 ff., 93, 141, 144 | Westcott, 19 ff., 49, 94, 119, 182 ff. |
| Testaments of the Twelve Patri-
archs, the, 120 | Wordsworth, 59 |
| Theocracy, the, 53 ff. | worship, spiritual, 69, 92 f., 142,
217 f. |
| Thomas, St., 165 | Wright, C. H. H., 100 |
| Tobit, the Book of, 116 f. | Zacharias, 125 |
| Twelve, the, mission of, 131 ff.,
138 | Zechariah, 83, 87 ff. |
| Tyre, visit of Christ to, 137,
146 f. | Zephaniah, 68 |

Date Due

[illegible]

220.7 T135C

87319

School of Religion

Duke University Libraries



D02472676Y

D02472676Y



DUKE LSC